

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 356 580

EC 302 018

AUTHOR Canter, Andrea, Ed.; Dawson, Peg, Ed.
TITLE Directory of Alternative Service Delivery Models.
Second Edition.
INSTITUTION National Association of School Psychologists,
Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 89
NOTE 114p.
AVAILABLE FROM National Association of School Psychologists,
Publications Department, 808 17th St., N.W.,
Washington, DC 20006 (\$20 non-members; \$15
members).
PUB TYPE Reference Materials - Directories/Catalogs (132)
EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Consultation Programs; Cooperative Learning;
*Delivery Systems; *Disabilities; Early Intervention;
*Educational Innovation; Elementary Secondary
Education; *High Risk Students; Mainstreaming; Mental
Health Programs; Models; *Nontraditional Education;
Program Descriptions; Program Effectiveness; Program
Evaluation; Referral; Special Education; Transitional
Programs

ABSTRACT

This directory offers a sampling of 74 programs that offer alternatives to traditional special education models for children with disabilities and at-risk children. The programs are classified into nine broad categories of program designs and emphases: (1) alternative curriculum/instructional strategies; (2) instructional management systems; (3) cooperative learning/peer support programs; (4) cooperative teaching programs; (5) alternative referral/consultation models; (6) alternative mental health support services; (7) alternative early intervention programs; (8) integration/transition programs; and (9) comprehensive restructuring of education. The chapter for each category begins with a brief description of the common features of the programs in that section. Programs reporting formal evaluation data supporting effectiveness and/or representing a large-scale approach with implications well beyond the local implementation are described in detail. The information, which is provided under the name of the state in which it is located, includes facts on funding, personnel, target population, referral procedure, costs and special equipment, evaluation, and replication, as well as extensive program descriptions. Other programs which provided less formal outcome data are presented as brief summaries. Two alphabetical listings are included, one of programs by states in which they are located and one by program title. (Contains approximately 200 references.) (JDD)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED356580

Directory of

Alternative Service Delivery Models

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL
IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN
GRANTED BY

Richard Ypp

Second Edition

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.



National Association of School Psychologists



Andrea Canter and Peg Dawson, Co - editors
Children's Services Committee

nc 302018

This publication is available from:

The National Association of School Psychologists
Publications Department
808 17th St NW
Washington, DC 20006

COST: NASP Members \$15.00
Non Members \$20.00

Copyright @ 1989 by the National Association of School Psychologists

**DIRECTORY OF
ALTERNATIVE SERVICE DELIVERY MODELS**

--Second Edition--

NASP Children's Services: Alternative Services Directory Subcommittee

Andrea Canter and Peg Dawson, Co-Editors

Mary Kay Braccio
Stephen Coolahan
Joan Silverstein

Sue Burkholder
Leslie Hale
Joseph Zins

The content of this document reflects the ideas and positions of the programs represented, and does not necessarily reflect the ideas or positions of the National Association of School Psychologists. Inclusion of a program does not imply endorsement by the editors or NASP.

National Association of School Psychologists
808 17th St. NW
Washington, DC 20006

1989

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements.....	ii
Preface.....	iii
Directory User's Guide.....	iv
Alphabetical Listing by State.....	v
Alphabetical Listing by Program.....	viii
Chapter One: Alternative Curriculum/Instructional Strategies.....	1
Chapter Two: Instructional Management Systems.....	13
Chapter Three: Cooperative Learning/Peer Support Programs.....	22
Chapter Four: Cooperative Teaching Programs.....	29
Chapter Five: Alternative Referral/Consultation Models.....	36
Chapter Six: Alternative Mental Health Support Services.....	47
Chapter Seven: Alternative Early Intervention Programs.....	53
Chapter Eight: Integration/Transition Programs.....	66
Chapter Nine: Comprehensive Restructuring of Education.....	70
Appendix A: NASP Position Statement-- Advocacy for Appropriate Educational Services for All Children.....	79
Appendix B: NASP Position Statement : Rights Without Labels.....	81
Appendix C: NASP Policy Statement : At-Risk Students and Excellence in Education: The Need for Educational Restructuring.....	83
Bibliography.....	85

Acknowledgements

This project depended upon the energy and support of many people. We would like to thank the NASP leadership for ongoing financial and philosophical support of alternative service delivery activities directed by the Children's Services Committee. CSC Chair Carolyn Cobb has devoted considerable time and effort to promoting alternative services and educational restructuring, and has provided invaluable input throughout the development of this directory. Alan Coulter has chaired the Alternative Services Task Force and has been helpful in disseminating the directory and locating resources. Tom Fagan, Chair of NASP Publications, has been most helpful in offering editorial and production suggestions, and in proofreading the final manuscript.

We particularly want to recognize the efforts of the subcommittee members, who reviewed and edited each entry-- Mary Kay Braccio, Sue Burkholder, Leslie Hale, and Joan Silverstein; Joe Zins and Stephen Coolahan compiled the references for the first and second editions.

We want to express our appreciation to Cyndi Martin and Sherry Anderson for their essential clerical assistance in putting this document into word processor form, to Liz Painter for providing graphics for the cover, to Terry Langager, principal of Woodland Elementary School in Eagan, Minnesota, for permitting us to use the laser printer for our final copy of the text, and to Janet Graden of the University of Cincinnati for printing the references.

Many thanks to the staff and students of the fifth grade Team Teaching classroom at Putnam Elementary School in Minneapolis-- Principal Eileen Baker, teachers Tim Carton and Tom Haack, and the children who served as willing subjects for our photos.

Finally, our thanks to the many educators who nominated programs and provided information for the directory entries. Without their input, we would have no directory!

A.C. and P.D.

11-1-89

Photo Credits: Darrell Young and Tony Mliner (front cover); Chandra Woods and Vixay Yang (back cover), fifth grade students in the Team Teaching Program at Putnam School (Minneapolis), taught by Tim Carton and Tom Haack (page 68). [Photos by Andrea Canter]

Preface

In 1985, the Delegate Assembly of the National Association of School Psychologists unanimously approved a Position Statement entitled "Advocacy for Appropriate Educational Services for All Children." In that statement, written by representatives of NASP and the National Coalition of Advocates for Students, NASP and NCAS asserted that increasing numbers of children are being inappropriately diagnosed as handicapped and placed in special education, in part because of a lack of regular education options to meet the needs of children "at risk" for educational failure.

This position statement also called for "the development and piloting of alternatives to the current categorical system" which would enable more children to be educated in regular education settings without the need for restrictive special education labels or placements. A subsequent Position Statement, "Rights Without Labels," developed guidelines by which such alternative programs could be evaluated.

Parallel to the NASP/NCAS Position Statement, in 1986 the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS), under the direction of Assistant Secretary of Education Madeline Will, issued a report which called for more cooperation between special and regular education in integrating children with learning problems into regular classroom settings. This report, now commonly known as the "Regular Education Initiative," stated that "there is increasing evidence that it is better academically, socially, and psychologically to educate mildly handicapped children with nonhandicapped children, preferably within the regular classroom." In 1989, the NASP Delegate Assembly approved another position statement, "At Risk Students," further specifying the importance of providing services to children within regular education.

Throughout this country, regular and special educators are increasingly collaborating to develop programs that meet the needs of handicapped and at-risk students. These programs offer exciting and innovative alternatives to the traditional special education process in which children are identified as handicapped and then removed from the regular classroom in order to receive instruction. The first NASP Directory of Alternative Service Delivery Models, published in 1987, included a sample of the programs that have been implemented throughout the United States. This second edition includes additional programs representing a wider range of options, as well as an expanded bibliography.

Programs were considered for inclusion in this directory only if they were truly alternatives to traditional special education models. While some alternative programs have documented success in meeting the needs of handicapped and at-risk students, others are so recently developed that program evaluation data are not yet available. In order to publicize a variety of innovative programs, we did not require documentation of effectiveness for inclusion in the directory, but did require that each program include an evaluation plan.

While this second Directory includes more programs than the first edition, we are well aware that there are many more model programs implemented throughout the country and reported in the professional literature. This Directory should be considered only a sampling of the range of alternative programs currently available, not an exhaustive or theoretically complete listing. We have included an expanded bibliography of publications relevant to developing alternative service models, and encourage the reader to refer to these books and articles, commonly available in university or professional libraries.

The inclusion of these model programs should not be construed as an official endorsement by the NASP Children's Services Committee. However, the Children's Services Committee does endorse the concept of alternative approaches to the education of handicapped and at-risk children, and applauds the efforts of the hundreds of professionals who have worked hard to develop these and many other model programs. It is our hope that this Directory will serve as a resource to others seeking constructive change, and promote further educational innovation.

Andrea Canter and Peg Dawson, Co-editors
Children's Services Committee / Alternative Services Directory subcommittee

Directory User's Guide

The programs in the first Directory were solicited through school psychology and special education networks throughout the country during the 1986-87 academic year; additional programs for the second edition were solicited through similar channels during the 1987-89 academic years. Programs from the first edition were also contacted in 1988 for updated information. Programs were nominated for inclusion either by program directors or by others familiar with them who believed they represented "alternatives" to traditional special education.

A survey questionnaire was sent to each nominated program, with over 80 programs responding with complete information. Children's Services committee members then reviewed each survey to determine if the program met established criteria for inclusion in the Directory. In addition to having an evaluation plan to assess effectiveness, each program has at least one of the following goals:

1. To reduce the numbers of children inappropriately identified as handicapped;
2. To reduce the restrictiveness of placements for handicapped children;
3. To increase the range of services and options available to at-risk children in the regular classroom;
4. To increase cooperation between regular and special education in working with both handicapped and nonhandicapped children.

Once a program was accepted, committee members condensed survey information into one of two formats: Programs reporting formal evaluation data supporting effectiveness and/or representing a large-scale approach with implications well beyond the local implementation are described in detail. Using a format similar to the original survey, these listings include funding, personnel, evaluation, and replication information as well as extensive program descriptions. At least one such model is presented in each of the nine chapters. Other programs which provided less formal outcome data are presented as brief summaries. Contact persons are noted for each program, and in some cases specific references are also included.

The programs are classified into nine broad categories of program designs and emphases for the purpose of organizing the Directory. These categories are not mutually exclusive and some programs could easily be classified into one or more other groupings. For example, while Cooperative Learning and Cooperative Teaching are separate chapters, at least one program includes both types of strategies. The programs included in each section do share some general features and goals, but many are unique in their combination of strategies and objectives. Each chapter begins with a brief description of the common features of the programs in that section, and a listing of those programs by state. The program entries in each chapter are organized alphabetically by state, with the expanded program entries first (noted by an asterisk), followed by the brief entries.

Two alphabetical listings are included, one of programs by states in which they are located, and one by program title.

Alphabetical Listing by State

ALABAMA	
Peer Collaboration.....	45
ARIZONA	
Achievement Based Curriculum.....	2
ARKANSAS	
Restructuring for Higher Order Learning.....	76
CALIFORNIA	
Alternative Strategies Network.....	10
Listen and Learn.....	68
COLORADO	
Systematic Teaching and Measuring Mathematics.....	10
CONNECTICUT	
Best Friends.....	26
Learning Strategies.....	4
DELAWARE	
Newcastle ALEM.....	16
FLORIDA	
Teens Involved in Teaching (TNT).....	26
IDAHO	
Building Level Education Teams.....	41
ILLINIOS	
Beethoven Project.....	62
Peer Consultant Program.....	37
Peer Mentoring.....	27
Preventive Intervention Student Support Model (PRISM).....	41
INDIANA	
Prereferral Checklists.....	42
Study Teams and Starter Notes.....	27
IOWA	
Relevant Education Assessment and Intervention Model (RE-AIM)....	71
Study Skills and Remediation.....	6
KANSAS	
Kidlink Preschool.....	63
Planning School Transitions.....	62
KENTUCKY	
Partnership Teaching.....	34
Prereferral Consultation and Intervention.....	42
LOUISIANA	
New Orleans ALEM.....	16

MAINE	
Cooperative Learning/Cooperative Teaching.....	30
Restructuring Schools Project.....	76
MARYLAND	
The Fourth R: Relationship Skills.....	51
MASSACHUSETTS	
Carnegie Schools.....	76
Early Recognition Intervention Network (ERIN).....	63
MICHIGAN	
Liaison Program.....	34
Prereferral Consultation.....	43
Project Children.....	42
Team Teaching.....	35
MINNESOTA	
Data-Based Decision-Making.....	18
District 287 Physically Handicapped Program.....	69
Fairbault ALEM.....	16
Friendly Universe.....	48
Hiawatha Cooperative Teaching Project.....	32
Montevideo ALEM.....	17
Problem Solving System (PSS).....	43
Project Dakota Outreach.....	54
Putnam Team Teaching Model.....	68
Simley High School Transition Program.....	69
MONTANA	
Content Reading Including Study Systems (CRISS).....	8
Precision Teaching Project.....	20
Responding to Individual Differences in Education (Project RIDE)....	43
NEW HAMPSHIRE	
Cooperative Learning Teams.....	23
Reading/Writing Process.....	10
NEW JERSEY	
Peer Outreach Services Team (POST).....	24
Turning Point: The Plan to Revise Special Education.....	77
NEW YORK	
Jowonio: The Learning Place.....	64
Less Restrictive Placement.....	44
Primary Mental Health Project.....	50
Resource Room Co-Teaching.....	35
NORTH CAROLINA	
Comprehensive Concept.....	73
Discovery Kindergarten Program.....	56
Lead Teachers Restructuring Project.....	77
NORTH DAKOTA	
Child Study Team.....	44

OHIO	
Building Level Teams.....	44
Inservice: Enhancing Teacher Effectiveness.....	51
Kindergarten Intervention Program.....	64
Multidisciplinary Team Decision Process.....	45
Peer Tutoring.....	28
Positive Education Program's Early Intervention Centers.....	65
Prereferral Consultation and Intervention.....	39
Project MARCS.....	67
 OREGON	
Parent Education Resource Center.....	51
Pathfinders.....	11
 PENNSYLVANIA	
Adaptive Learning Environments Model (ALEM).....	14
Consultation/Screening Model.....	45
Interboro Outdoor Education.....	11
Lock Haven ALEM.....	17
 RHODE ISLAND	
Warwick Parent/Child Counseling Program.....	52
 UTAH	
Functional Mainstreaming for Success.....	65
Preschool Transitions/Social Integration.....	58
 VIRGINIA	
Hampton University Mainstreaming Project.....	60
 WASHINGTON	
Project MERGE.....	74
Project Success.....	12
Schools for the 21st Century.....	78
 WISCONSIN	
Peer Collaboration.....	45
The Rainbow Room.....	33

Alphabetical Program Listing

Achievement Based Curriculum.....	2
Adaptive Learning Environments Model (ALEM).....	14
Alternative Strategies Network.....	10
Beethoven Project.....	62
Best Friends.....	26
Building Level Education Teams.....	41
Building Level Teams.....	44
Carnegie Schools.....	76
Child Study Team.....	44
Comprehensive Concept.....	73
Consultation/Screening Model.....	45
Content Reading Including Study Systems (CRISS).....	8
Cooperative Learning Teams.....	23
Cooperative Learning/Cooperative Teaching.....	30
Data-Based Decision-Making.....	18
Discovery Kindergarten.....	56
District 287 Physically Handicapped Program.....	69
Early Recognition Intervention Network (ERIN).....	63
Fourth R: Relationship Skills.....	51
Friendly Universe.....	48
Functional Mainstreaming for Success.....	65
Hampton University Mainstreaming Project.....	60
Hiawatha Cooperative Teaching Project.....	32
Inservice: Enhancing Teacher Effectiveness.....	51
Interboro Outdoor Education.....	11
Jowonio: The Learning Place.....	64
Kidlink Preschool.....	63
Kindergarten Intervention Program.....	64
LEAD Teachers Restructuring Project.....	77
Learning Strategies.....	4
Less Restrictive Placement.....	44
Liaison Program.....	34
Listen and Learn.....	68
Multidisciplinary Team Decision Process.....	45
Parent Education Resource Center.....	51
Partnership Teaching.....	34
Pathfinders.....	11
Peer Collaboration.....	45
Peer Consultant Program.....	37
Peer Mentoring.....	27
Peer Outreach Services Team (POST).....	24
Peer Tutoring.....	28
Planning School Transitions.....	62
Positive Education Program's Early Intervention Centers.....	65
Precision Teaching Project.....	20
Prereferral Checklists.....	42
Prereferral Consultation.....	43
Prereferral Consultation and Intervention (Kentucky).....	42
Prereferral Consultation and Intervention (Ohio).....	39
Preschool Transition/Social Integration Project.....	58
Preventive Intervention Student Support Model (PRISM).....	41
Primary Mental Health Project.....	50

Problem Solving System (PSS).....	43
Project Children.....	42
Project Dakota Outreach.....	34
Project MARCS.....	67
Project MERGE.....	74
Project Success.....	12
Putnam Team Teaching Model.....	68
Reading/Writing Process.....	10
Rainbow Room.....	33
Relevant Education Assessment and Intervention Model (RE-AIM).....	71
Resource Room Co-Teaching.....	35
Responding to Individual Differences in Education (Project RIDE).....	43
Restructuring for Higher Order Learning.....	76
Restructuring Schools Project.....	76
Schools for the 21st Century.....	78
Simley High School Transition Program.....	69
Study Skills and Remediation.....	6
Study Teams and Starter Notes.....	27
Systematic Teaching and Measuring Mathematics.....	10
Teens Involved in Teaching (TNT).....	26
Turning Point: The Plan to Revise Special Education.....	77
Warwick Parent/Child Program.....	52

Chapter One

Alternative Curriculum/Instruction Strategies

Programs in this chapter include specific curriculum modifications or instructional approaches implemented within the regular education setting with a wide range of students. "Learning to learn" skills are emphasized over specific content, thus increasing the potential of generalization to other areas of the curriculum. Several programs concern a specific subject area such as reading or math, while others use an alternative approach to a wider range of subject matter, such as outdoor education programs and study skills training.

Program entries:

*Arizona: Achievement Based Curriculum

*Connecticut: Learning Strategies

*Iowa: Study Skills and Remediation

*Montana: Content Reading Including Study Systems

California: Alternative Strategies Network

Colorado: Systematic Teaching and Measuring Mathematics

New Hampshire: Reading/Writing Process

Oregon: Pathfinders

Pennsylvania: Interboro Outdoor Education

Washington: Project Success

ARIZONA

Achievement Based Curriculum Model: Project I Can

Address: Department of Physical Education
Arizona State University, 111 PE East
Tempe, AZ 85287

Phone: (602) 993-2903

Director: Dr. Janet Wessel

Contact: Same

Funding Source: Federal and local school district funding; National Diffusion Network (U.S. Department of Education)

Target Population: All children preschool through secondary with particular focus on children with handicaps and special needs children in the mainstream.

Program Description: The ABC Model: I Can was designed in 1971 to focus physical education instruction on the attainment of specific outcomes, rather than on a collage of activities that are not necessarily related to outcome. The curriculum is intended to meet the biological, motor, and social-leisure needs of individuals in order to improve life quality. The objective-based instructional program provides criterion-referenced assessment and evaluation of competencies, resource materials for students from near zero to functional level of mastery on essential physical objectives selected by staff, and flexibility in responding to local needs to build a quality program or supplement existing programs. No special equipment or facilities are needed. Two major components of the ABC model are teacher training to implement instruction, and the objective-based materials themselves. This objective book enables local schools to select and develop their own programs for students. Systematic teaching and assessment of performance objectives is emphasized at all levels of development. Physical education teachers in special and regular education settings can implement the program.

ABC Model: I Can was approved by the Joint Dissemination and Review Panel for dissemination through the National Diffusion Network as a model program in 1981 and again in 1985. Currently it is in operation in 13 states, 36 school districts, 113 schools, with 7 leadership training centers at university sites.

Referral Procedure: All students in the school setting receive the ABC curriculum assessment system to determine instructional needs and level of placement in the program.

Personnel Required: Available physical education personnel, regular and/or special education including adaptive physical education staff. Adoption requires one person designated as coordinator.

Costs: Personnel- 3 days teacher release time.

Training- shared costs with National Diffusion Network

Materials- variety of curriculum materials available for purchase

Special Materials/Equipment: None needed

Evaluation Plan/Results: ABC Model: I Can has been validated by the State of Michigan (1979), JDRP/NDN in 1981 and 1985. 75% students achieve meaningful, significant gains on objectives; 85% of all teacher training in the program achieved intended competencies. For evaluation reports, contact Dr. Bernard Holland at the ABC Model: I Can address above. See references below.

Replication/Implementation: ABC Model: I Can is intended to be adopted at minimal cost. Districts usually cover teacher release time (3 days), teacher training kit (\$7), travel and per diem for consultants. State grants, Chapter I funds, and private funding are often available to help defray adoption costs. ABC Model: I Can will subsidize training expenses not authorized by state or local

agencies. Adoption requires following the program training design and training for the program coordinator. ABC Model: I Can staff and trainers are available to present awareness sessions for local, regional or national meetings; materials are available for purchase (awareness materials are free); training expenses will be shared. Model demonstration sites can be visited by contacting the ABC Model: I Can project center.

References/Publications:

Wessel, J.A. (1981). Effectiveness of the I Can physical education instructional system for handicapped individuals, k-12: Summary report. Canadian Journal of Applied Sport Sciences, 6 (4).

Wessel, J.A. (1982). Objective-based instructional program: Systems approach to applied instruction in physical education for the handicapped. Exceptional Education Quarterly, 3 (1).

Wessel, J. & Kelly, L. (1986) Achievement-Based Curriculum Development in Physical Education. Philadelphia: Lea and Febiger. (\$28.50 paper)

(Additional references available from project director)

Curriculum packages available include "Preprimary Motor and Play Skills," "I Can Sport, Leisure and Recreation Skills," and "I Can Primary Skills." Full programs or individual modules can be purchased. For ordering information, contact: Hubbard, PO Box 104, Northbrook IL 60062, or call toll free (800) 323-8368, or contact project director regarding these and other curriculum guides.

CONNECTICUT

Learning Strategies

Address: Wilton High School
395 Danbury Rd
Wilton, CT 06897

Phone: (203) 762-0381

Director: David Iskovic

Contact Person: Same

Funding Source: Local district grant (initially), normal school budget

Target Population: Mildly to moderately handicapped (LD) students in a suburban senior high school; eighteen students currently served. Students need to be highly motivated and attending the majority of their classes in the mainstream.

Program Description: The primary goal of Learning Strategies is to prepare LD students to function productively in mainstream classes. Learning Strategies is based upon the work of Dr. Donald Deshler at the University of Kansas as an approach to teaching strategy skills to learning disabled students. A portion of instructional time is devoted to learning "plans of attack" which are then applied to content material. Such instruction enables the student to become more proficient in using learning strategies and thus more independent in learning. District funding provides inservice training and follow-up to school staff in the methods of teaching strategy skills, including paraphrasing, word identification, error monitoring, and sentence strategies. The general structure of instruction includes pretesting in the strategy area, explanation of the strategy needed, obtaining an oral commitment from the student to learn the new strategy, describing the steps involved, modeling, verbal rehearsal, controlled practice and feedback, grade-appropriate practice and feedback, post-testing, and generalization (application in mainstream class). Students are taught the strategies in tutorial classes, with different sections offering different strategies. Group instruction is given through the verbal rehearsal phase, and then individualized for each student. For many LD students, Learning Strategies must be supplemented with other supporting services such as Reading Lab. During the second year of the program (1985-86), generalization was emphasized, including provision of consultation to regular education staff.

Referral Procedure: LD students enrolled in special education classes are screened and evaluated via pretests on specific strategies to determine if the program is appropriate to their learning needs.

Personnel Required: Consultant trained in the Deshler approach who can train staff and generate materials; special education staff as allocated by local district.

Costs: Personnel: \$150 per hour for trainer
Training: \$16 per hour for trainees to attend inservice programs

Special Equipment: VCR, TV, manuals for each strategy

Evaluation Plan/Results: The program has been evaluated by an independent agency as required by the grant. A student survey was designed and given to each student involved in the program. The majority of the students enjoyed the experience and felt adequate time was allowed for practice. Many tried to use the strategies in mainstream classes, with most reporting some success and a few reporting high success. The special education staff also responded positively to the program. Drawbacks include the time needed by teachers to develop materials and manage instruction via daily charting. High staff commitment and district financial support is essential to success. A report of the evaluation is available from Cooperative Educational Services, Norwalk CT.

Replication/ Implementation: Consultation is available from program staff; formal training will be available in the future once a trainer is hired. Formal training is currently available through the University of Kansas, Dr. Donald Deshler. Site visits at Wilton High School can be arranged through the director. Strategy manuals are available for each strategy area at \$10 each.

References/Publications: Contact the program director for further information about publications available.

IOWA

Study Skills Assessment and Remediation

Address: J. Kuepper Enterprises
2900 Garden Avenue
Burlington, IA 52601

Phone: (319) 753-2402

Director: Joan E. Kuepper

Funding Source: Normal school budget

Target Population: Students of all ages, teachers, support staff, parents, counselors, and administrators (for some phases).

Program Description: This program is an approach to remediating study skills deficits that consists of four phases, each one building on the prior phase. The project is implemented by the school psychologist in either one-to-one, one-to-small group, or one-to-total class settings. The school psychologist also provides inservice training to teachers, counselors, and other psychologists.

The four phases are:

(1) **Prevention of Study Skills Deficits.** Two separate sessions are offered, one geared towards students (all ability levels) and one geared towards parents. The overall outline content is tailored to a specific age level, but the general components covered in the student presentation include: listening, following directions, asking questions, notetaking, reading, test taking skills, organizing these study skills, and planning. The parent presentation focuses on supporting student study skills and includes discussion of motivation, strengthening specific weaknesses (e.g. poor quality, incomplete work, and missing work), and communication to and from school. An abbreviated version of the student presentation is also made.

(2) **Pre-referral Activities: A Focus on Study Skill Building.** Individual or small group sessions are held with students which focus on specific study skills targeted by the referring adult. Sessions are held weekly for up to 6 weeks with a rating of both participation and results for the following week (as shown by work samples and teacher monitoring). The number and type of skills practiced and degree of practice varies as perceived needs indicate. If significant difficulties persist in spite of good effort, a request for formal referral may be made.

(3) **Study Skills Assessment Activities.** All current curriculum materials are utilized in an interview, demonstration and work review format. Discussion and role playing classroom settings are used to determine present study/organizational strategies and competencies. Formal achievement testing with standardized instruments may also be included at this point. A profile is developed indicating comparisons of what is expected/required to where student is presently functioning. Teachers cooperate with students, counselors or psychologists in updating assignment lists during the time of evaluation and results are shared among all involved plus parents. A special education placement may or may not be warranted.

(4) **Study Skills and Organizational Remediation/Facilitation Activities.** The psychologist plans and helps implement changes in programming either to build in daily practice in deficit skill areas or work around severe deficit areas. Plans may focus on an individual student (via IEP) or, in some cases, entire special education classes or regular education classes.

Referral Procedure: Students can be referred by school personnel or parents. A student must be willing to participate, with parent approval, and is assumed to have the ability to profit from the level of instruction provided. There must be evidence of poor study habits/skills by self-report, teacher report, or parent report. There must be academic underachievement.

Personnel Required: As per training as offered, the program is implemented by the school psychologist, although through inservice training, teachers and others can learn to apply these techniques.

Costs: No additional costs beyond the time spent by the school psychologist.

Special Materials/Equipment: None required

Evaluation Plan/Results: The program is evaluated by teacher, counselor, parent and student reports as well as a comparison of grade/credit status by transcript. Approximately 1/4-1/3 of students have made significant improvements in all content areas and organization. Approximately 1/2 have made noticeable improvement in at least one content area (up to 2 areas and organization). Approximately 1/10 have made no improvement or dropped from participation in one of the programs. In some cases teacher techniques in presentation have been altered to improve areas such as notetaking and advance organizers.

Replication/Implementation Information: Telephone consultation is available. Inservice training has been developed tailored to teachers, counselors, parents, and students. Site visits can be arranged by contacting Joan Kuepper (address above). Workshop/Inservice information available upon request with description of individualized offerings and costs.

References/Publications: A general description of the project is available free. Available for purchase is a book entitled Homework Helpers: A Guide for Parents Offering Assistance, from Educational Media Corp., Box 21311, Minneapolis, MN 55421 (\$9.95 + shipping).

MONTANA

Content Reading Including Study Systems (CRISS)

Address: School District No. 5
233 1st Avenue East
Kallispell, MT 59901

Phone: (406) 755-5015

Director: Lynn Havens

Funding Sources: Federal funds: The program has been in operation for 9 years, and received funding for 3 of those years.

Target Population: CRISS has been used in 150 school districts, involving 300 schools. The program is used with regular education students, including those identified as high risk, and/or low achievers at the middle through high school levels.

Program Description: The Content Reading Including Study System (CRISS) Project was developed in 1979 to help students better organize, understand, and retain course information. Through CRISS instruction, students "learn how to learn" by mastering three component skills: 1) how to integrate new information with prior knowledge, 2) how to participate actively in their own learning, and 3) how to self-monitor to identify which strategies are the most effective for a given set of learning materials. The CRISS instructional framework includes four sequential components: Introduction (the instructor develops rules or steps of the lesson), Modeling (The teacher "talks through" or verbally models for the students his/her own reading of a section of the students' text), Guided Practice (students try the modeled strategies during class discussion), and Independent Application (students independently use what they have learned). This sequence is applied in teaching all aspects on the CRISS program.

The instructional content of the CRISS Project includes:

- Text Assessment and Teaching Text Organization
- Student Assessment
- Main Idea Development
- Learning Guides and Writing Activities
- Vocabulary
- Directed Reading Activity

Materials provided by the project include instructional materials, a training manual, and an Adopter's Guide, which outlines implementation and evaluation procedures for school administrators. A local facilitator from each district oversees the project and serves as a liaison between teachers and the CRISS Project staff.

Referral Procedure: All teachers and students at the school using CRISS are involved in the program.

Personnel Required: Schools using CRISS are encouraged to have a local facilitator, who is responsible for coordinating the two-day inservice and organizing follow-up meetings with the trained teachers.

Costs: Personnel- 2 days teacher released time. Recommended participants include two teachers from each content area, one administrator from each school, and the local facilitator.

Training- The adopting district(s), the State Facilitator, and the CRISS Project staff negotiate travel, lodging, and trainer expenses.

Materials- Participant fee of \$35.00 covers the cost of the 200 page training manual, the adopter's guide, workshop materials, and evaluation.

Special Materials/Equipment: None needed

Evaluation Plan/Results: Three effectiveness studies have been completed on CRISS. The first study involved eight junior level social studies classes, four of which were "college bound" and four were designated as vocational or "non-college bound". Data obtained from pre and post test measures of free recall, and a multiple choice (recognition) measure of American History knowledge, indicated consistent and significant changes related to the CRISS program. In the second study, two non-college bound sophomore science classes were employed to investigate CRISS, with one class serving as the treatment group. Pre- and post-testing again indicated significant gains by the treatment group. A third study, conducted at a school which adopted the program, showed the same significant gains as had been obtained in the studies at the developmental sites, thus indicating the generalizability of the effects. Detailed evaluation reports are available from the Program Director.

Replication/Implementation: Experience of the CRISS staff and evaluation data indicate that the program is readily implemented in other school districts. The program is inexpensive and has no recurring costs. No special facilities or teaching staff are required. Adoption requires participation in the two-day inservice, at which time the training manual and materials are disseminated. Consultants are available to travel to the training site. A follow-up visit by the trainer is recommended within six months to a year after adoption. The project staff also provides training for certified trainers. Visits to the Montana site are allowed and the project staff expect to have sites in Maine, Florida, Massachusetts, and Wisconsin within the next year (visits to these sites need to be arranged through the Montana site).

References/Publications:

Comprehensive Reading Strategies for all Secondary Students, Charles C. Thomas Publisher, 2600 South 1st St., Springfield, IL 62794-9265.

NDN Educational Programs That Work, \$11.95 from Sopris West Inc., 1120 Delaware Ave., Longmont, CO 80501.

CALIFORNIA

Alternative Strategies Network
349 Vereda Del Ciervo
Goldeta, CA 93117

Contact: Lauren Miller (605) 968-5293

The Alternative Strategies Network is a program to share ideas and information among people working with students with exceptional needs. Information regarding nontraditional strategies (e.g. cooperative learning, "challenge education", etc.) will be shared via a newsletter. The newsletter will emphasize practical ideas and offer an opportunity to report on implementation experiences. This network is in its beginning stage.

COLORADO

Systematic Teaching and Measuring Mathematics (STAMM)
Jefferson County Schools
1005 Wadsworth Blvd
Lakewood CO 80215

Contact: Sherry Stumbaugh (303) 231-2381

STAMM is a complete K-12 mathematics program built around a framework of objectives and criterion-referenced tests, with supporting materials for Chapter I, special education, and gifted/talented students. The program is adaptable to many different situations including small or large-group instruction, individualized programs, team teaching, and math labs. Materials (for teachers and students) can be used by an entire district or by an individual teacher. Initial and ongoing assessment of mastery are essential to implementing STAMM. This program was validated by the JDRP in 1976 and recertified in 1985. In the host district, there has been a 25% increase in the number of students scoring above the national norm on standardized math tests. Evaluation reports, materials, on-site training and consultation, and additional information are available from the project coordinator.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

The Reading/Writing Process
Stratham Memorial School
Stratham, NH 03885

Contact: Peg Dawson (603) 778-7772
Lincoln Street School
Exeter, NH 03833

The Reading/Writing Process is an individualized language arts program which increases the ability of the regular classroom teacher to meet the needs of handicapped or at-risk students in the regular classroom. Students write for at least 30 minutes a day, at least 4 days a week. The setting and format are very structured, but students may pursue their own topics. Brief conferences with students include mechanics of writing. Daily silent reading time is the other component, which also includes daily small group interaction to discuss the books in general. A reading journal is also

required of students which the teacher reads and about which she makes comments. No extra cost is required and an evaluation is underway to assess reading skills and writing skills improvement.
OREGON

Pathfinders
Jefferson Middle School
1650 W. 22nd
Eugene, OR 97405

Contact: Corey Stout (503) 687-3221

Pathfinders integrates outdoor skills into regular middle school curriculum for nonhandicapped students who usually have poor grades, high absenteeism, and possible drug involvement. Students attend the program daily for three-week periods, and participate in all-day, off-campus field trips twice per month. Specific emphasis is placed on the development of social skills, conflict resolution, goal setting and attainment, values clarification, self-esteem, and the use of fund-raising projects. The outdoor-environmental curriculum provides a backdrop for achieving program goals. Funding has been provided by Chapter 1 and local district at-risk funds.

PENNSYLVANIA

Interboro Outdoor Education Program
Interboro School District
9th and Washington Ave
Prospect Park, PA 19076

Contact: Dr. Robert Petruzzi (215) 461-6700

Interboro provides handicapped students with a hands-on outdoor education program. Participants include students from two 5th and 6th grade self-contained classrooms for learning disabled and emotionally handicapped students, and regular education 6th grade students who choose to participate. Both groups help with fund-raising activities to pay for the outdoor education trips. Different camping trip formats have been used. On trips, students study diverse topics related to the outdoors, and participate in a variety of activities designed to improve relationships. As a result, students experience different roles in the group and learn the importance of sharing, trust, and communication. Friendships developed through Interboro help ease the transition to junior high the follow year. Positive outcomes include increased performance on content measures, excellent feedback from teachers, parents, and students, and improved relationships between regular and special education students. Costs are \$4000-\$8000 per year depending upon sites selected.

WASHINGTON

Project Success- Intensive Basic Reading Services
North Kitsap School District
8998 NE West Kingston Rd
Kingston, WA 98346

Contact: Ronald Smith (206) 297--2969

Project Success is a flexible, comprehensive reading program for students at all ages, including adult non-readers. Proficiency leading to good comprehension is emphasized, along with drill and constant review. Peer tutoring is a major component. This program can be implemented for individuals, small groups, classrooms, and as part of a student's IEP. Materials are available from the Edmark Corporation. Excellent gains in word attack skills have been documented for elementary students taught by paraprofessionals and by secondary school student tutors. Materials were revised in 1988.

Chapter Two

Instructional Management Systems

This group of programs includes systems of instruction and environmental modification implemented within the regular classroom to address the needs of all students. These programs are more comprehensive and ecologically oriented than those in the preceding chapter, and address all areas of the curriculum. Most are examples of the Adaptive Learning Environments Model (ALEM), a comprehensive educational program designed to address a wide range of abilities and needs. Services, adapted curriculum, and instructional management strategies are brought into the regular classroom. A general description of the ALEM model precedes the specific entries.

The two additional programs included in this chapter provide comprehensive systems for monitoring student progress, both for making decisions about student programming and for identifying student needs within regular education. One program (the Montevideo ALEM model) incorporates the progress monitoring strategies within the ALEM instructional framework.

Program entries:

*Pennsylvania: Adaptive Learning Environments Model

- DE: Newcastle
- LA: New Orleans
- MN: Faribault
- MN: Montevideo
- PA: Lock Haven

*Minnesota: Data-Based Decision-Making

*Montana: Precision Teaching Project

PENNSYLVANIA

Adaptive Learning Environments Models (ALEM)

Address: Temple University
Center for Research in Human Development and Education
934 Ritter Annex
Philadelphia, PA 19122

Phone: (215) 787-3000

Director: Dr. Margaret Wang

Funding Source: Federal grants--"Implementation, Evaluation, and Dissemination of the ALEM as a National Follow Through Program" (U.S. Department of Education); "College-School-State Collaborative Model for Personnel Preparation" (Office of Special Ed Programs, U.S. DOE).

Program Sites: Approximately 4000 students (regular and special education) are currently served in ALEM programs throughout the country, in 130 schools/school district, elementary and middle school.

Program Description: ALEM is a comprehensive educational program designed to improve the abilities of school personnel to effectively accommodate the diverse academic and social needs of individual students in regular education. The product of more than 15 years of development and field testing, the ALEM is an alternative intervention for serving students of various abilities, experiences, and socio-economic backgrounds. Components of the program are in use in hundreds of classrooms throughout the United States as a core general education program, as a special education program, and/or as part of the compensatory education services provided through such programs as Chapter 1 and the National Follow Through Program.

ALEM addresses the individual learning characteristics of students through adaptive instruction; individual differences are viewed as the norm rather than the exception. A wide range of methods, materials, and procedures are used to increase each student's ability to profit from the learning environment, without the negative effects of special labeling or segregation. Although differences in the rates of progress are acknowledged by teachers, parents and students, each student is expected to acquire basic academic skills and to develop social competence and self-esteem. Under ALEM, students are also taught to take responsibility for their own learning by participating in the planning and management of their instruction and their learning tasks.

The dual focus of ALEM involves 1) the specific strategies of adaptive instruction, and 2) systematic structures to support program implementation. The strategies or mechanisms for providing adaptive instruction include individualized progress plans, a diagnostic-prescriptive monitoring system, and the Self-Schedule System (a classroom instructional-learning management system). The features that support program implementation include an adaptive program delivery system, a training sequence known as the Data-Based Staff Development Program, school and classroom organizational supports, and family involvement.

ALEM has been shown to dramatically reduce the need for segregated "pull-out" programs and settings. By focusing on educational intervention rather than student placement, the program has also proven successful in reducing both the stigmatization of handicapped students by others, and the student's self perception of "exceptionality".

Personnel Required: The staffing patterns in ALEM classrooms vary according to the resources and the particular improvement goals of each school in which the program is implemented. For all implementation settings, however, there must be a program development and implementation specialist who is responsible for program monitoring and supportive staff development activities. It is preferred that this specialist have a background in classroom teaching, curriculum development, and training, and might be a building-level administrator (e.g., principal), a teacher, or a district-level professional such as a curriculum development specialist.

To serve students with special needs, specialized personnel support general education teachers by aiding in the diagnostic-prescriptive process, providing direct instruction, and serving as consultants. The professional support staff of local schools and districts, including school psychologists, social workers, and curriculum specialists, are also involved in the planning and provision of instruction-related services. At the classroom level, instructional teaming is advised as a strategy to maximize various student grouping options and the individual skills and interests of teachers.

Costs/Implementation: Costs vary depending upon available resources and improvement goals of individual schools/districts. In many cases, a school's current curriculum materials and staff resources can be adapted for use.

Training modules and manuals on various aspects of implementing adaptive instruction are available for purchase. Consultation and training are available regarding awareness, needs assessment, implementation planning, curriculum refinement/development, and staff training. ALEM demonstration schools are located across the country for site visits. Contact the program director for information about training, replication, and obtaining materials.

Evaluation: Overall, ALEM has been found to be cost-effective despite start-up costs (curriculum, staff development). Reduction in the combined spending for general and special compensatory education typically follow implementation. ALEM is supported by an ongoing program of research and evaluation. Data are collected regarding program implementation, classroom processes, and a variety of learning outcomes. Copies of published articles and technical reports in research findings are available for the cost of duplication.

References:

Wang, M.C., & Birch, J.W. (1984). Comparison of a full-time mainstream program and a resource room approach. Exceptional Children, 51, 33-40.

Wang, M.C., & Birch, J.W. (1984). Effective special education in regular classes. Exceptional Children, 50, 391-398.

Wang, M.C., Gennaari, P., & Waxman, H.C. (1985). The adaptive learning environments model: Design, implementation and effects. In M.C. Wang & H.J. Walberg (Eds.), Adaptive instruction to individual differences. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Wang, M.C., Peverley, S., & Randolph, R. (1984). An investigation of the implementation and effects of a full-time mainstream program. Remedial and Special Education, 5 (6), 21-32.

Wang, M.C., Reynolds, M.C., & Schwartz, L.L. (198). Adaptive instruction: An alternative educational approach for students with special needs. In J. L. Graden, J. E. Zins, & M.J. Curtis (Eds.), Alternative educational delivery systems: Enhancing instructional options for all students. Washington, D.C.: National Association of School Psychologists.

ALEM Programs

DELAWARE

Carrie Downie Elementary School
Frenchtown Road
Newcastle, DE 19720

Contact: Dolores Higgins (302) 323-2926

The ALEM program at Carrie Downie serves first and second graders according to the Temple University model. The evaluation procedure involves quarterly observations and standardized testing. Funding is provided by federal, state, and local sources.

LOUISIANA

Livingston Middle School
7301 Dwyer Rd
New Orleans, LA 70126

Contact: Connie Yeaton (Principal) (504) 241-4360

This ALEM model is implemented via a \$500 state grant to the New Orleans Public Schools, for the sixth through eighth grade students at Livingston Middle School. This is one of six pilot sites in the state. Approximately five handicapped and fifteen nonhandicapped students are enrolled in each class, where regular and special education teachers team teach. The handicapped students had previously been enrolled in self-contained classrooms. Personnel are provided by the local district, with the \$500 grant used for materials. Two three-day sessions of staff development are also funded by state money.

MINNESOTA

Garfield School
421 SW Third Street
Faribault, MN 55021

Contact: Jim Douglas (507) 334-4349

Garfield Elementary School's ALEM program serves all students in a small town/rural community with a relatively high Asian immigrant population. A computerized program monitors student progress and facilitates goal planning. All handicapped students at Garfield attend math and reading instruction in the regular education classroom; special education staff bring resources into the classroom to support special education students. A half-time administrator and 20 hours per week paraprofessional were added to the school staff through state funding. Additional funds (\$3500) were needed for initial training. State and federal evaluations indicate that handicapped students received as much special education support after ALEM was implemented as they did before, and that their achievement was either stable or improved. In addition, communication between regular and special education staff improved, parent and staff regarded the program positively, and students exhibited more appropriate and on-task behavior.

MINNESOTA

Montevideo Public Schools
6th and Grove
Montevideo, MN 56265

Contact: JoAnne Peterson (612) 269-6471

All Montevideo students in grades K-12 participate in ALEM, funded by Chapter One and Follow Through federal monies. This model includes individualized math and reading curriculum, and a Task Management System to coordinate all classroom activities and exploratory learning centers. A computerized instructional management program allows for constant monitoring of student progress and helps to identify those students to target for instructional intervention. Evaluation indicated improved communication between special and regular education staff, improved self concept of handicaped students, improved or stable achievement, and a high degree of parent and staff satisfaction.

Reference:

Peterson, J., Heistad, D., & Peterson (1985). Montevideo Individualized Prescriptive Instructional Management System. Exceptional Children, 52, 239-243.

PENNSYLVANIA

Keystone Central School District
Dickey Elementary Office
South Fairview St
Lock Haven, PA 17745

Contact: Mary Garcia (717) 748-2101 /3101 /8750

The ALEM model at Dickey Elementary (K-6) requires no funding beyond \$700 per building for training and materials. Participatory decision-making at weekly staff meetings is an important feature of the Keystone program. The role of each staff member is redefined to make the best use of the resources available within the building. The district-wide curricula is used with adaptations made by the school staff. Preliminary evaluation indicated a consistent pattern of academic progress and less labeling of students.

MINNESOTA

**Data-Based Decision Making Model for
Exiting Special Education Students**

Address: Moundsview Public Schools
2959 N. Hamline Av
St. Paul, MN 55113

Phone: (612) 636-3650

Director: Dan Hoverman, Director
Department of Special Education

Contact: Clyde Ekar/Dan Hoverman
Edgewood Community Center
5100 N. Edgewood Dr.
St. Paul, MN 55112
(612) 784-0016

Funding Source: Normal school budget

Target Population: This program serves all K-8 handicapped students and low achievers in the Moundsview School District, including ten schools in the suburban St. Paul area.

Program Description: The Moundsview Schools have adopted a K-8 data-based process for entering students into direct special education services (mildly handicapped, LD and EMH), monitoring progress, and determining appropriate exiting from services. A curriculum-based measurement system in reading, spelling, math, and written language was developed from regular education curriculum materials and normed on the local school population, and is the basis for entry and exit rules. Median performance data were also obtained for low performing regular education groups. Weekly data are collected for each student served with an IEP for direct special education, and compared to low curriculum group median scores. If the special education student's scores are at or above the low group median for three consecutive measurements over three weeks, services can be reduced to a monitoring level--moving the student back into the mainstream low curriculum group. Once in the mainstream, the student's progress is continually monitored; if progress continues at or above the low group median for three months, special education services are terminated. Students cannot be exited from service if functioning below the re-entry group median.

The Moundsview model addresses necessary variables regarding the transition of special education students to the mainstream: 1) Criteria demand that the special education student functions at or above the re-entry group median; 2) data are always available for comparing the special education student and nonhandicapped peers in the same curriculum; 3) repeated assessment of the handicapped student and re-entry group is very sensitive to the student's progress within the group; 4) exited special education student's performance is equal to or greater than performance while in direct service.

Referral Procedure: District procedures for special education referral are used--teacher, parent or agency referral, screening, and placement evaluations. All special education students in the district are included in the process using the decision rules. A prereferral intervention phase precedes special education assessments to determine the effectiveness of mainstream modifications.

Personnel Required: District special education teachers and psychologists are involved in implementing the process. The usual special education staff to student ratios apply, as it is part of the entire special education process.

Costs: There are no costs beyond normal special education funding for personnel and materials.

Special Materials/Equipment: There are no unique materials or equipment, although computers greatly assist implementation of the program. District materials are available at duplicating costs.

Evaluation Plan/Results: Data for thirty months have been analyzed (as of winter, 1987), including special education student progress in service, regular education students growth in curriculum areas at all grades, percentages of students exited or having services reduced, and the progress of special education students after reducing or terminating service. In 1985-86, nearly 13% of the special education students were exited or had services reduced (58% of this group had services terminated). Complete reports of evaluation results are available from either Clyde Ekar or Dan Hoverman at the above address.

Replication/Implementation: Consultation and materials are available; a formal training program is available as well as opportunities for site visits.

References: Contact Clyde Ekar or Dan Hoverman at the above address for a list of materials available.

MONTANA

Precision Teaching Project

Address: 3300 3rd St. NE
Great Falls, MT 59404

Phone: (406) 791-2270

Director: Dr. Ray Beck

Contact: Suellen Gabriel

Funding Source: Federal funding (National Diffusion Network; initial funding through Title III and 4-C grants)

Target Population: All students, preschool-grade 12, regular and special education, and classroom teachers; initially aimed at special education students. Presently, 500 school district use the model (132,000 students).

Program Description: Precision Teaching is a set of measurement procedures that guide teachers and students in making better educational decisions. It can be used to monitor student progress in basic academic skills, and assist in making curriculum decisions regarding current instruction. Direct, daily measurement involving one-minute timings and charting in each skill area indicates if current instruction is appropriate or if modifications are needed. Teachers thus have daily means of evaluating and recording performance, procedures for interpreting and applying information to decisions, and a set of practice materials that complement instructional objectives. Students receive daily practice, charts of progress, and individually paced curriculum, and assist in making instructional decisions. While initially developed to assist students with academic deficits, the program now also functions as a preventive measure for "at risk" students and as a skill building procedure for regular education students. The program in Great Falls serves as a training center with on-site and off-site programs. The state of Montana has validated the program for use in grades K-12.

Referral Procedures: All students and teachers participate

Personnel Required: Regular classroom teachers with a preferred ratio of 1:20; special education teacher with a ratio of 1:8-10.

Costs: Personnel --\$15/person
Materials --\$350/school
Training -- \$400/day for two-day training

Special Equipment: Timing sheets available at duplicating costs; training manuals, implementation handbook and materials directory available for purchase.

Evaluation Plan/Results: Joint Dissemination Review Panel (federal) validated the program for national dissemination in 1975; longitudinal data have been collected on special education students. Recent studies of regular education students compared Precision Teaching with control subjects and found significantly higher achievement with Precision Teaching, using standardized achievement tests. Improvement occurs regardless of SES. Classroom observation and teacher and student interviews have also been included in evaluation efforts. Students and teachers rate the program highly, and it appears to motivate interest and performance. Teachers also report that Precision Teaching helps maintain handicapped students in the regular classroom. In special education classrooms, Precision Teaching also appears successful based upon observation and interview. JDRP and other evaluation reports are available from project director.

Replication/Implementation: Adoption commitment can be made by a district, school or classroom, and must involve administrators, support staff, and regular and/or special education teachers. Initial training requires two or three days limited to 30-35 participants. Workshops generally are conducted at the adopted site, but can be arranged at the training site. Follow-up training of up to two

days is provided 6-8 weeks after initial training. All major components of the program must be adopted. Adoption of Precision Teaching requires that sites evaluate student progress via pre/post achievement test data, and pre/post precision teaching frequency data; use of control groups is optional. Assistance in evaluation is available from the training site. Visitors are welcome at project site, and Awareness Packet is available free. Contact Dr. Ray Beck for information.

References/Publications: Training Manual, Screening Manual, Implementation Handbook, Materials Directory can be ordered from the project.

Chapter Three Cooperative Learning/Peer Support Programs

Recent research underlines the importance of cooperative learning strategies to enhance student performance. Instruction is structured so that students work together to meet shared goals. Students not only are concerned with their own mastery of the material, but are also responsible for working with peers to assure their mastery. Using cooperative learning strategies, students show gains in achievement, self esteem, positive attitudes toward learning, and positive attitudes towards others. Particularly, relationships between handicapped and nonhandicapped students are enhanced. Cooperative learning requires individual accountability (frequent assessment), collaboration among students (leadership, decision-making, communication, etc.), and group processing skills. The program at Hudson Elementary School is a prime example of the Cooperative Learning model, with handicapped and nonhandicapped students working together in learning teams.

Peers can also support each other through specific programs of tutoring and supportive activities. The Peer Outreach Services Team in Fort Lee, New Jersey offers a variety of peer support services to meet a wide range of student needs, while other programs included in this chapter offer peers as subject-area and social skills tutors.

Program entries:

*New Hampshire: Cooperative Learning Teams

*New Jersey: Peer Outreach Services Team

Connecticut: Best Friends

Florida: Teens Involved in Teaching

Illinois: Peer Mentoring

Indiana: Study Teams and Starter Notes

Ohio: Peer Tutoring

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Cooperative Learning Teams

Address: Hudson Elementary School
3 Library Street
Hudson, NH 03051

Phone: (603) 883-7765

Director: Thomas J. Scott

Contact: Same

Funding Source: No additional funds beyond normal school budget

Target Population: Learning disabled students who normally would receive "pull-out" services in a resource room in an elementary school serving grades 1-4. The program serves 50 handicapped and high risk students and 150 regular education students in a small town setting.

Program Description: LD students are mainstreamed into regular education classrooms 100% of the time in grades 1-4. Two teachers and 1 paraprofessional (ideally, one special education and one regular education teacher) at each grade level form a team with each having approximately 25 students. Up to 30% of the students on a team are considered handicapped or at-risk; The other 70% are "normal" students. The instructional approach emphasizes Cooperative Learning strategies. Students work in small groups helping each other master tasks. They are rewarded for group success but are also held individually accountable for mastering skills.

Referral Procedures: All LD students who would otherwise require resource support are included in the program. Of the regular education students included, approximately 30% are above average students and 40% are average students. Handicapped students continue to have an I.E.P.

Personnel Required: 2 teachers, ideally 1 regular and 1 special education teacher and 1 paraprofessional per grade level.

Costs: No additional costs to maintain program. Existing special education staff is reorganized. Start-up costs: 3 day workshop for staff on Cooperative Learning (\$2500).

Special Materials/Equipment: None

Evaluation Plan/Results: Pre-Post-testing in reading and math using the Stanford Diagnostic Test. With 7 months between pre- and post-testing, the average reading gain for LD students was 1.24 years and the math gain was 1.19 years. Evaluation results are currently being written up and can be obtained from Thomas J. Scott, Director of Special Services, Hudson School District, 1 Memorial Drive, Hudson, NH 03051

Replication/Implementaiton: Training can be requested from David and Roger Johnson, Center for Cooperative Learning, University of Minnesota, 150 Pillsbury SE, Minneapolis, MN 55455.

References/Publications: See ERIC- Cooperative Learning

NEW JERSEY

Peer Outreach Service Team (POST)

Address: Child Study Team
Fort Lee Public Schools
265 Whiteman St
Fort Lee, NJ 07024

Phone: (201) 585-4652

Director: Dr V. Alex Kehayan

Contact: same

Funding: No funds beyond normal school budget except for transportation costs (district funds).

Target Population: Elementary and secondary handicapped and nonhandicapped students at risk for chemical dependency, scapegoating, poor achievement, dropout, child abuse, and delinquency in suburban New Jersey school district.

Program Description: POST is a multi-service peer helping program operating from Ft. Lee High School. Twenty to twenty-five high school students are trained annually to provide a variety of services to meet student needs: 1) Smooth Transitions - juniors and seniors serve as guides to incoming 9th graders to help facilitate academic and personal adjustment. 2) Welcome Program - juniors and seniors assist students moving into Fort Lee High School from other districts, with emphasis on survival within the peer system. 3) One-to-One - High school and middle school students are trained to provide peer support and tutoring to underachievers in their schools. This program is designed to prevent school failure, substance abuse, truancy, and drop-outs. 4) Peer Intervention Network (PIN) - This provides an on-going support group for middle school underachievers. Students form partnerships to identify problems, generate goals, and carry out plans of action. 5) Partners Against Scapegoating - Partners enter middle school family life and health classes to lead sessions of structured experiences designed to increase sensitivity to verbal assault and degradation. High school students help middle school pupils develop alternatives to scapegoating others, and help promote coping skills. 6) Planning Leisure Activities Now (PLAN) includes high school students leading groups of younger students (grades 6-8) to help deal with loneliness, time management and anxiety. Sessions are held during lunch and move from general coping skills to developing alternatives for open time. 7) Human Relations Support to Students with Special Needs - Sessions to promote self awareness, self esteem, coping and social interaction skills are lead by POST students with 8th grade special education students. 8) Kids R Safe - Peer-led workshops teach elementary pupils positive strategies to deal with potentially harmful strangers. Safety tactics to prevent child abduction are highlighted in puppet shows and role-played scenarios. 9) Close Encounters - Four sessions teach 6th grade students facts and myths about chemical dependency and how to use personal resources to refuse drugs and still invoke a positive state. 10) Community outreach - Post students extend to community agencies, professional organizations and other districts, via demonstrations and specific topical sessions.

POST has been in operation for 15 years. Training is ongoing and includes regular supervision and recycling peer helpers as assistant trainers of new recruits.

Referral Procedure: Varies with specific component of program. Teacher and parent referrals are needed for parts 1-4; Partners Against Scapegoating is provided to half of the family life classes in 8th grade; screening procedures are used for the PLAN project; Smooth Transitions involves referrals of underachieving, withdrawn 8th graders; Nonassertive and passive transfer students are referred to Welcome; Human Relations Support is available to all 8th grade special education students; Kids R Safe is available to first and second graders; Close Encounters is available to fifth and sixth graders.

Personnel Required: One coordinator, 10-15 peer counselors, 3 peer advisors (LD consultant, teacher and school service coordinator) to supervise peer counselors, 2 second-year peer counselors to serve as assistant trainers. Components 1-3 have one-to-one ratios; components 4-8 have 1:12-25 ratios; advisor to peer counselor ratio is 1:2.

Costs: All staff and peer services are volunteer. Program guides are available at cost. Transportation costs \$1000.

Special Materials/Equipment: Video is used for training and presentations at conventions. Full manual and guide to all interventions available from Dr. V Alex Kehayan.

Evaluation Plan/Results: A variety of procedures have been used with each component. Peer counselors are given pre-and post-tests (Gazda Perception Scale) to measure responding skills. Each group served completes feedback questionnaires, and results are incorporated into future program cycles. Teachers' evaluations of individual POST helpers are received periodically through meetings with peer helpers and POST guidance staff. New programs and changes are developed through ongoing evaluation. Generally, results have indicated students improve academic performance, self esteem, attendance, and self efficacy. Further information is available from references below.

Replication/Implementation: POST is flexible in implementation, as a district could adopt one or more components as desired. The framework can be tailored to the needs of a particular school and staff. Partners for Change: training manual and program guide are available for \$39.95 from the program director. Another publication, "SAGE," with training and implementation strategies is available for \$15.00 from the program director. A VHS video cassette describing the program is also available. Consultation at a new site is available for the cost of transportation and expenses. Site visits at Ft. Lee High School can be arranged. Contact the program director.

References/Publications:

Kehayan, V. A. (1988). Partners for Change: Positive strategies and prevention programs for peer leaders and professionals. Available from author for \$39.95.

Kehayan, V. A. (1986). Partners against scapegoating (PAS). Directive Teacher, 8 (1), 12-13.

Kehayan, V. A. (1986) Peer Outreach Service Team (POST): A multi-service program. Peer Facilitator Quarterly, 4 (2), 4-5.

Kehayan, V. A. (1983). Self Awareness Growth Experiences (SAGE). (\$15.00 from author)

Kehayan, V. A. (1980). POST: a student-helping program. (parts 1, 2, 3). The Guidance Clinic. September, October and November issues.

CONNECTICUT

Best Friends
Hale Ray High School
Plains Rd
Moodus, CT

Contact: Thomas Ahern (203) 873-8656/9533

In the Best Friends program, 14 high school students are paired with special needs elementary students, and meet during school hours for weekly 90 minute sessions involving lunch and individual/group activities. High school students receive a one-time 1/2 credit per year and a pass/fail grade. The program seeks to create an alternative environment where interpersonal skills, affective education, and self esteem issues can be explored. In addition, the high school students develop leadership skills by facilitating group activities. Recently the program has been recognized as an affiliate alternative program in the Big Brothers/Big Sisters of America organization. Self-report inventories indicate that students gain increased sense of meaningfulness and self esteem, as well as improved interpersonal and leadership skills. Consultations, site visits, and a program manual are available upon request.

FLORIDA

Teens-N-volved in Teaching (TNT)
Levy County School
P.O. Drawer 129
Bronson, FL 32621

Contact: Renee Speisman

TNT's goal is to increase educational services to "at-risk" learners through peer tutoring. High school students are paired with elementary students experiencing learning and behavioral difficulties in the classroom, and provide one-to-one instruction in academic and/or social skills. Tutors are trained in content areas, procedures, evaluation, and reinforcement of progress, and keep a daily log of activities, ideas, and observations. Daily tutoring sessions may include drill, academic games, reading to the student, or precision teaching. Classroom teachers monitor progress and reinforce tutors, as well as determine skills and materials for instruction. Student progress is charted via direct, continuous measurement. Evaluation also includes group achievement test data. This program requires no additional funding, and involves the school psychologist, high school counselor, classroom teachers, and educational program specialists.

ILLINOIS

Peer Mentoring
Glenbrook High Schools
1835 Landwehr Rd
Glenview, IL 60025

Contact: Dr. Joan Gross (312) 998-6100

Peer Mentoring provides social tutoring and academic support to secondary TMH, BD, and LD students on a daily basis. Regular education high school students may elect to take the Peer Mentoring course for credit, and receive an orientation, weekly meetings with mentee's special education teachers, and three evening seminars. Participating special education students may take a course from a mentor under the supervision of a special education teacher, or enroll in a regular education course with mentor tutoring, or parallel a regular education course and gradually move into it with mentor support. Other options are also available as the need arises. Tutoring is provided for 40 minutes per day over at least 18 weeks. Social tutoring is a critical component. The special education students learn what is "cool," how to greet familiar and unfamiliar persons, how to enter and participate in a conversation with peers, what to wear etc. Over time, intense sponsoring relationships evolve and changes have been observed in the general student culture as a result of these new extended relationships between mentors and mentees. Evaluation to date (three years of implementation) indicates that both regular and special education students change their perceptions of self and others as a result of this program. A report of the evaluation is available from the project director.

INDIANA

Study Teams and Starter Notes
Speedway Junior High School
5151 W. 14th St
Speedway, IN 46224

Contact: Patricia Mirsky (317) 244-3359

Study Teams and Starter Notes are two methods to facilitate teaching mildly handicapped and at-risk students within the regular classroom. Study teams involve a study captain and two or three other students working on class assignments together after introductory instruction from the teacher. Starter Notes is another team project that allows each student to receive a handout of key words and phrases that follows text. An outline is completed in the study team. No extra costs beyond the normal school budget. Informal evaluation indicates that studying is easier and students feel they learn more.

OHIO

Peer Tutoring Program
St. Rita's School
32815 Linden Dr
Solon, OH 44139

Contact: Audrey Bashian (216) 349-6255

The Peer Tutoring Program trains 8th grade students to serve as tutors for primary grade (K-3) students who are having difficulty in specific areas such as motor skills, reading, spelling, and math. Tutoring sessions are held once or twice weekly for 40 minutes. Tutors meet bi-weekly or monthly with the school psychologist for ongoing training and discussion of experiences. Peer tutor effectiveness has consistently been rated as superior on evaluation forms completed by supervising teachers and peer tutors. Recommendations for specific trainer and peer tutoring books have been made by program personnel. An evaluation report and sample letters to parents and teachers are available for \$1.00. Consultation from staff is also available.

References:

Ehly, S. & Larson, S. Peer tutoring for individualized instruction. Allyn & Bacon.

Peer Tutoring: Learning by helping. Available from Educational Media Corp., PO Box 21311, Minneapolis, MN 55421.

Chapter Four

Cooperative Teaching Programs

The underlying assumption of cooperative teaching models is that successful mainstreaming of handicapped students requires communication and cooperation among regular and special education teachers. Rather than pulling students out of the regular classroom for special education instruction, special education teachers collaborate with the regular education teacher to provide support and even direct instruction in the mainstream. Both teachers share instructional responsibilities. Some cooperative teaching models also incorporate cooperative learning strategies. Programs might be structured around specific content areas such as reading or math and/or target special needs students, or may involve a restructuring of the total learning experience for all students in a classroom. In other models, cooperative teaching is primarily a communication system which formalizes the interactions between regular and special education teachers.

Program Entries:

*Maine: Cooperative Learning/Cooperative Teaching

*Minnesota: Hiawatha Cooperative Teaching Project

*Wisconsin: The Rainbow Room

Kentucky: Partnership Teaching

Michigan: Liaison Program

Michigan: Team Teaching

New York: Resource Room Co-Teaching

MAINE

**Cooperative Learning/Cooperative Teaching:
A Rural Staff Development Project**

Address: UMF Center for Cooperative Learning
Merril Hall
86 Main St
Farmington, ME 04938

Phone: (207) 778-3501 X 225

Directors: Joanne Putnam and Kathryn Markovchic

Contact: Joanne Putnam

Funding Source: PL 94-142 discretionary monies channeled through state

Target Population: Middle school and junior high mildly to moderately handicapped students in a small town school district.

Program Description: This staff development and research project promotes mainstreaming and social integration through cooperative learning strategies. An underlying assumption is that successful mainstreaming requires active communication and cooperation among regular and special education staff. To accomplish this goal, teachers need training in instructional methods appropriate to integrated learning activities and a professional support structure. Participating teachers meet with University of Maine consultants monthly to improve implementation of cooperative learning techniques and share ideas. Peer coaching teams at each school are also used to promote cooperative learning and teacher support.

Referral: All mainstreamed special education students are included, and spend part of the day in regular education classes.

Personnel: "Facilitating teacher" to coordinate staff development and student integration; university consultants (trainers)

Costs: Personnel - \$12,000
Research/Eval - \$8,000
Staff development \$20,000

Special Equipment/Materials: Cooperative Learning Center network newsletter; annotated bibliography on mainstreaming and cooperative learning. No special equipment or materials needed for instruction.

Evaluation Plan/Results: Evaluation is focused on student and teacher outcomes. Student data are collected through interviews, questionnaires, and direct performance measures. Data includes the number and type of referrals to special education, number of students mainstreamed and degree of integration, peer ratings of regular and special education students (Behavior Rating Profile), records of school attendance, suspension, expulsion, detention; demographic data, direct observation of behavior, academic achievement data from standardized tests. Student data are obtained for those in cooperative classrooms, noncooperative classrooms, and special education classrooms to compare differences in attitude and behavior. Data from 38 classrooms are available. Qualitative data are collected through structured interviews and pre/post questionnaires regarding classroom atmosphere.

Teacher outcomes are measured through questionnaires, self-ratings, and structured interviews. Peer observations are used to document implementation of cooperative learning procedures.

Data will soon be available regarding the results of this evaluation. If interested contact the project directors.

Replication: Consultation from project staff is available at \$250/day. Formal workshops are available on cooperative learning, and site visits can be arranged with the project directors:

References: A list of relevant references is available from the directors, and includes the following:

Kagan, S. (1988). Cooperative learning: Resources for teachers. CA: University of California.

Putnam, J., Rynders, J., Johnson, R., & Johnson, D (in press). Effects of collaborative skill instruction on promoting positive interpersonal interactions between moderately-severely mentally handicapped and non-handicapped children. Exceptional Children.

Slavin, R.E. (1980). Cooperative learning. Review of Educational Research, 50, 315-342.

MINNESOTA

Hiawatha Cooperative Teaching Project

Address: Hiawatha Elementary School
4201 42nd Ave. South
Minneapolis, MN 55406

Phone: (612) 627-2750

Director: Ann Benning (Special Education Resource Teacher)

Funding Source: Normal school budget

Target Population: K-3 students and teachers, support staff in an inner city elementary school; nonhandicapped, mildly handicapped, and physically handicapped students served.

Program Description: The Hiawatha Project is a collaborative regular/special education instructional model to improve the reading and readiness skills of students at-risk for school failure and special education placement. Students are identified, and their progress monitored, using curriculum-based measures within the regular education classroom. Regular education teachers have primary responsibility for meeting the academic needs of high risk students. Those identified as high risk are placed in small groups within the mainstream classroom. Special education, Chapter One, remedial instruction teachers, tutors and paraprofessionals provide supplemental reading, language and readiness instruction within the classroom. Supplemental instruction is provided for 25 minutes per day in groups of 5-6 students. All staff meet weekly to plan instruction, share lesson plans, and discuss student progress. Progress is monitored weekly, with data used to make decisions regarding placement in groups, instructional strategies, or motivational strategies.

Referral: All students in the K-3 program are screened using CBM measures. They are placed in target groups if district achievement test scores are below the 25th percentile, if reading or readiness screening is below the 25th percentile, if weekly progress is below expectations, or if teacher or parent expresses specific concerns. All students currently identified as handicapped are included, but an IEP is not required for participation. Students are exited from groups if progress is at or above expectations (CBM measures, mastery tests, etc.).

Personnel Required: District allocated staff in regular and special education, including Chapter One and Intervention (remedial instruction) program staff.

Costs: A one-time expenditure of \$3500 for staff training.

Evaluation/Results: Student progress is monitored on an ongoing basis through weekly criterion-referenced tests, curriculum-based measurement, review of screening data three times per year. Staff evaluation also provides suggestions for improving student performance. Rates of special education assessment and placement also are included in the evaluation of the program. While results are still in the preliminary stages, 1987-88 data indicate that reading and readiness scores for the entire school population increased dramatically from fall to spring in all grades. Each grade also showed a decrease in the number of students qualifying for special education assessment - only 3 new IEPs for special education service were written during the 1987-88 school year in grades K-3.

Replication: Consultation and site visits are available by contacting the school principal. Additional information about this project and its evaluation can be obtained from Dr. Doug Marston, Minneapolis Schools Special Education Department, 254 Upton Ave S., Minneapolis, MN 55405.

Reference:

Marston, D. (1989, May) The Hiawatha Project. Communique (NASP).

The Rainbow Room

Address: Hackett Elementary School
533 W. Grand Av
Beloit, WI 53511

Director: Jan Duxstad
Roosevelt Administration Center
1633 Keeler Av
Beloit, WI 53511

Phone: (608) 364-6025

Funding Source: Normal school budget

Target Population: Low achieving, handicapped and at-risk students in grades 1-6. All learning disabled students are included. Students (52-60 each year) are largely poor, from single-parent families with high rates of illiteracy and histories of noninvolvement in the school.

Program Description: The Rainbow Room is a comprehensive program based upon effective instruction research, designed to improve academic achievement and social adjustment for students experiencing failure. Cooperative relationships among regular and special education teachers and parents help redesign the total school environment to obtain measurable gains. A team (principal, regular education teachers, learning disabilities resource teacher, paraprofessional, and support services staff) provides direct and indirect instruction support to target students in two classrooms separated by a partition for flexible grouping. Homogeneous and heterogeneous strategies are used, with a student: staff ratio of 10-12:1. Direct instruction strategies are the primary teaching technique. Team teaching and curriculum modification are essential components of a partnership between regular and special education.

Referral procedure: All identified learning disabled students are assigned to the Rainbow Room at the appropriate grade level. Others "at-risk" or who are already experiencing significant academic delays may be assigned to the program if they appear to have the potential to achieve at a higher level and do not have a primary behavioral or emotional problem interfering with performance. Exit criteria have also been established.

Personnel required: Staff assigned to school program -- 3 regular education teachers, 1 LD resource teacher, 1 paraprofessional, 1 counselor, building principal, other support staff.

Special materials/equipment: Computers (System 80), program evaluation manual

Evaluation plan/ results: Evaluation includes two parts: 1) change in student achievement according to test scores and grades, and 2) staff and parent reports of satisfaction with program. Standardized testing program used by Beloit Schools to measure student progress includes the Gates-MacGinitie and STEPS achievement tests. Students in second through fifth grades improved from an average grade of "C" (3.0) to average grades between A and B (4.7). Using goal attainment scaling methods, high degrees of satisfaction were reported by parents, teachers and students. A full report can be obtained from the director.

Replication/Implementation: Manual, handouts, materials are available. Consultation and site visits can be arranged.

KENTUCKY

Partnership Teaching
Jefferson County Schools
4407 Heatherbrook Dr
Louisville, KY 40220

Contact: Judith Lazar/Thelma Jordan (502) 491-4558

Partnership Teaching pairs regular and special education teachers in order to decrease the number of students who fail regular education classes in grades K-12. The regular and special education teachers together identify the individual needs of each student (including reviewing IEP goals of special education students), then plan and implement teaching strategies as a collaborative effort. This program appears to increase the learning of basic skills, increase the success rate of at-risk and handicapped students, increase teacher effectiveness, and increase communication between regular and special education teachers. This program appears to be effective in all content areas. Each building with Partnership Teaching has a contact (coordinating) staff person who helps select team members, serves as a resource to the partnership teams, plans inservice meetings, and gathers evaluation data. At the high school level, over 98% of the special education students in this program are mainstreamed for four or more classes, 100% participate in at least three mainstream classes; and two-thirds participate in regular education 100% of the time. In 1987-88, 23% of the high school special education students were exited from service. This program requires no funds beyond the normal school budget.

MICHIGAN

Liaison Program
Wylie Groves High School
20500 W. Thirteen Mile Rd
Birmingham, MI 48010

Contact: Leslie Thirjung

Liaison Program provides a vehicle for improved communication between special education and regular education staff regarding special education students placed in the mainstream. Each regular education teacher has a special education teacher who serves as his/her liaison. They discuss students they have in common and share information with all relevant teachers. No special funds are required beyond the normal school budget. Informal surveys indicate that teachers appreciate the improved communication among special and regular education staff, and the streamlined communication of student data.

MICHIGAN

Team Teaching

Wylie Groves High School
20500 W. Thirteen Mile Rd
Birmingham MI 48010

Contact: Leslie Thirjung

Special and regular education teachers co-teach classes of at-risk and handicapped students using the general education curriculum. Regular education teachers are primarily considered "content" experts, while special educators are considered "process" experts. Costs include sufficient staff to allow special education teachers to spend approximately three periods per day in team-teaching activities. Inservice from staff is available (\$200 per diem fee) as are printed materials and a videotape.

NEW YORK

Resource Room Co-Teaching

Fairport High School
1358 Ayrauit Rd
Fairport NY 14450

Contact: Ellen Arnold (716) 473-2426

Co-teaching involves collaboration between special and regular education teachers. The regular education teacher is responsible for instruction and classroom management, while the special education teacher provides study skills assistance, review, feedback, and monitoring of student performance of handicapped and at-risk high school students. There are no costs beyond the normal school staffing. Formal evaluation is in-progress; students have shown good performance and staff are very positive about continuing and expanding the program.

Chapter Five

Alternative Referral/Consultation Models

These programs all provide direct assistance to regular education teachers to help them design and implement interventions to support students within the mainstream, thus reducing the need for special education referral and service. Many are termed "prereferral" programs, where teachers refer students to a team or support staff member for consultation. In some programs, the procedure or screening tool itself has proven to be an effective intervention, while others emphasize collaborative consultation leading to specific interventions for students. The most effective of these programs have demonstrated success through behavioral or direct performance measures and/or through reductions in special education placements. Other programs provide inservice training in order to increase the skill level of teachers so that they can more effectively accommodate students with mild learning or behavioral problems.

Program Entries:

*Illinois: Peer Consultant Program

*Ohio: Prereferral Consultation and Intervention

Idaho: Building Level Education Teams

Illinois: Preventive Intervention Student Support Model

Indiana: Prereferral Checklists

Kentucky: Prereferral Consultation and Intervention

Michigan: Project Children

Michigan: Prereferral Consultation

Minnesota: Problem Solving System

Montana: Responding to Individual Differences in Education

New York: Less Restrictive Placement

North Dakota: The Child Study Team

Ohio: Building Level Teams

Ohio: Multidisciplinary Team Decision Process

Pennsylvania: Consultation/Screening Model

Wisconsin/Alabama: Peer Collaboration

Peer Consultant Program

Address: Kensington School
2201 S. Evanston
Arlington Heights, IL 60004

Phone: (312) 398-3210

Director: Jeff Petersen / Nancy Buechin McGill

Contact: Nancy Buechin McGill and Liz Robinson

Funding: Federal funds

Target Population: The Peer Consultant Program serves students K-12 and their teachers in a suburban school system. Target students include special education students in the mainstream, regular education students who are discrepant in behavior or are low achievers, a group of problematic students, or an entire classroom. Classroom teachers are the direct recipients of the consultation services.

Program Description: The Peer Consultant works with teachers to successfully maintain special needs students in the regular classroom, and to help any interested teacher expand his/her teaching skills. Upon request from a teacher, the Peer Consultant works with the teacher to develop an appropriate program for the referral situation. This program is based upon direct observations by the Peer Consultant and meetings with the referring teacher. After the teacher implements the program, the Consultant assists as needed and helps evaluate the program's success.

Consultants (regular education teachers themselves) are trained via 14 sessions (3 hours each) that emphasize behavioral and academic intervention strategies, measurement of student performance, and consultation skills. Trainees practice skills in their own classrooms, and are observed by a trainer and then participate in a follow-up discussion. 89 teachers have completed training since 1985, and over half of these have received referrals for consultation in their buildings. All participants implement at least one program or systematized technique in their classroom during training and follow-up shows that most continue to use the skills they have learned.

Referral Procedure: Teachers volunteer for training as Peer Consultants. To date, participants have been proficient and skilled teachers. (This is not a remedial program for teachers.)

Personnel Required: Administrators, from principals to superintendents, must provide support and commitment in the form of released time for participating teachers to attend weekly training sessions and to work with other teachers on request. A program director coordinates training of volunteer teachers. Peer Consultants implement programs in the building. Substitute teachers are required to release teachers for training and to perform the Peer Consultant role.

Costs: Personnel-\$370 per teacher for substitutes
\$25-35,000 per trainer
Materials/Equipment-\$35-45 per teacher

Special Materials/Equipment: None

Evaluation Plan/Results: Data have been collected on teacher behavior. Peer Consultants maintain logs on the use of services in school. Follow-up questionnaires indicate limited use of service in some buildings. Principals and teachers have often indicated a desire to have Peer Consultants more widely used. Actual application is a present goal in some schools; an implementation evaluation is underway with results expected during 1987-88. Consumer satisfaction survey results are available on request. Pre/post tests indicate positive growth in level of knowledge, level of comfort, perceived and observed use of techniques and knowledge as demonstrated by correct response to test items.

Replication/Implementation: Training for other districts is not available at this time. Observers are welcome (contact directors).

References/Publications: Contact program directors.

Prereferral Consultation and Intervention

Address: Hamilton County Office of Education
11083 Hamilton Ave.
Cincinnati, OH 45231

Phone: (513) 281-1138

Director: Charlene Ponti

Target Population: At risk and handicapped students in grades 1-8 who are experiencing academic and/or behavior problems.

Program Description: An intervention assistance program has been implemented in two schools as a preventive procedure for students at risk for learning and behavior problems. Emphasis is on early identification and subsequent intervention designed to maximize success in the regular education setting. The program expands the role of the school psychologist and other special service providers by emphasizing consultation, intervention, and prevention activities. The collaboration of teachers and support staff leads to the development of systematic intervention plans, which are implemented and documented prior to special education referral. The pre-referral team (Intervention Assistance Team) includes the school psychologist, speech/language therapist, counselor, nurse, special education teacher(s), and principal, as well as referring classroom teacher. Teachers request pre-referral team meetings when a student is experiencing difficulty. The team then identifies a primary consultant from the team to work individually with the referring teacher on an intervention plan. Collaborative problem-solving processes are used. Data are collected to help define the referring problems, then goals are set, strategies developed, and the program implemented by the classroom teacher and/or parents. Additional consultation is available if modifications are needed. The consultant helps evaluate intervention effectiveness. If goals are not met within a specified time period, the team may reconvene to consider alternatives. A peer and parent tutoring program is also established with parent and junior high student volunteers trained to tutor students found through the pre-referral system to be experiencing academic difficulties. The overall intent of the system is to reduce referrals to special education programs, thus maintaining more students in the regular classroom.

Referral Procedure: Classroom teachers seek assistance regarding students experiencing difficulty in academic and/or behavioral areas. An individual consultant or the entire pre-referral team engages in problem solving and implements interventions; the team may also refer to other resources if the pre-referral intervention is ineffective.

Personnel Required: Usual support service personnel are included in the process (school psychologist, speech clinician, counselor, school nurse, special education teacher, principal, etc.). The classroom teacher is responsible for implementing intervention programs. Student and parent volunteers are needed to implement tutoring intervention option.

Costs: None beyond normal school budget (assumes appropriate support staff are available)

Evaluation Plan/Results: Data have been collected on student outcomes and efficacy of the pre-referral system. Positive outcomes for students have been documented (reductions in behavior problems, reduction in teacher referral for psycho-educational assessment); there have been increased requests for consultation, an increase in the frequency of consultation, and decrease in special education assessments and placements in the schools using the system. Teachers also express greater satisfaction with special education services. (See references)

Replication/Implementation: This system has been replicated elsewhere, and requires no special personnel or materials for implementation. Consultation is available from the project director. Contact Charlene Ponti at above address.

References/Publications:

- Curtis, M.J. , Zins, J.E., & Graden J.L. (1987). Prereferral intervention programs: Enhancing student performance in regular education settings. In C.A. Maher & J.E. Zins (Eds.), Psychoeducational interventions in the schools. New York: Pergamon.
- Ponti, C.R., Zins, J.E., & Graden, J.L. (1988). Implementing a consultation-based service delivery system to decrease referrals for special education: A case study of organizational considerations. School Psychology Review, 17, 89-100.
- Zins, J.E., Curtis, M.J., Graden, J.L., & Ponti, C.R. (1988). Helping students succeed in the regular classroom: A guide to developing intervention assistance programs. San Francisco; Jossey-Bass.
- Zins, J.E., Graden, J.L., & Ponti, C.R. (in press). Prereferral intervention to improve special services delivery. Special Services in the Schools.
- Zins, J.E., & Ponti, C.R. (1987). Prereferral consultation: A system to decrease special education referral and placement. The Community Psychologist, 20, (2), 10-12.

(Other references are available frm the project director)

For Further Information Contact: Charlene Ponti

IDAHO

Building Level Education Teams

Couer d'Alene Public Schools

311 N 10th St

Couer d'Alene, Idaho 83814

Contact: Gary Stanton (208) 664-8241

"Ed Teams" are problem-solving bodies which serve to reduce the number of inappropriate referrals to Special Education and support teachers and students within regular education. The teams provide prereferral intervention and behavior consultation, determine needs for peer tutoring, counseling, agency referral, or other support services. Other issues such as grade retention, three-year reevaluations, and pre-staffing planning are addressed. Teams include administrators, Chapter I, psychologists, special education staff and counselors, and may include other personnel as needed. This program has been cited by the Idaho Department of Education as a "Best Practice" model, and has reduced special education placements, particularly those in self-contained settings.

ILLINOIS

Preventive Intervention Student Support Model (PRISM)

LaGrange Area Department of Special Education

1301 West Cossitt

LaGrange, IL 60525

Contact: Coordinator, Student Assessment and Support Systems

(312) 354-5730

Referring teachers meet with the Student Support Team (SST) to define the areas of concern. One or more members of the SST consult with the regular education teacher to develop an intervention plan. The plan is monitored and revised as necessary. If it is determined that a student may require special education, a "Case Study Evaluation" is initiated. Funding is included in the normal school budget. Consultation from staff, on-site training, and program evaluation data are available for a negotiated fee.

INDIANA

Prereferral Checklists for Principals and Teachers

Speedway Public Schools
5151 West 14th Street
Speedway, IN 46224

Contact: Patricia S. Mirsky (317) 244-3359

A checklist of alternatives and intervention options is provided to teachers so that appropriate intervention can/may preclude a referral for special education. Items range from hearing screenings to classroom modifications. When a teacher refers a child for testing, he/she completes a prereferral checklist which includes a review and accumulation of pertinent records and a classroom observation by the building principal. No additional funds were needed. Program evaluation data are not available.

KENTUCKY

Prereferral Consultation and Intervention

Beechwood Schools
50 Beechwood Road
Ft. Mitchell, KY 41017

Contact: Joe Zins (513) 475-3335

Intervention Assistance Teams (as previously described in the Hamilton County, OH model) are used to help teachers analyze student problems and implement instructional, environmental and/or curricular modifications. Teachers and special education providers are trained to use curriculum-based assessment procedures to monitor student progress in order to determine whether a special education referral is warranted. Program evaluation data and consultation are available.

MICHIGAN

Project Children
Allen Street School
1614 E. Kalamazoo
Lansing, MI

Contact: Ellen Chaney or Michele Orians (517) 374-4024

Teacher's refer "at-risk" children to the general education team (consisting of a teacher consultant, school psychologist, and social worker) who assesses the child using interviews, record reviews, observations, and classroom interaction. The team then lists and prioritizes needs, develops a "push-in" (as opposed to a "pull-out") program, and delineates roles for each team member. The support person may model, teach, monitor, or assist in implementation in any innovative way. The cost totaled \$94,000 which was obtained from Chapters 1 and 2 federal fund monies. Program evaluation is in progress.

MICHIGAN

Prereferral Consultation
Wylie E. Groves High School
20500 W. Thirteen Mile Road
Birmingham, MI 48010

Contact: Rick Stanfield

The pre-referral plan involves a contract between support staff member(s) and the parent(s) of students encountering unsatisfactory school experiences. The contract specifies timelines and methods of intervention. At the expiration of the contract, a staffing is held to share feelings and experiences. Follow-up services are delineated and summarized in a report to be shared with the student's teachers. Available staff members are utilized. No program evaluation data are available.

MINNESOTA

Problem Solving System (PSS)
Rosemount-Apple Valley School District
14445 Diamond Path
Rosemount, MN 55068

Contact: Brenda Cumming (612) 431-8242

Guidelines for the PSS are contained in "red folders" and outline the appropriate steps to be followed in identifying student problems, developing interventions, and monitoring progress. Teachers initiate the process and work with a school team which typically includes a special education teacher and/or a school psychologist. Available school staff are utilized. The PSS manual is available at cost. Staff consultation is also available.

MONTANA

Project RIDE (Responding to Individual Differences in Education)
3300 3rd St NE
Great Falls, MT 59404

Contact: Suellen Gabriel (406) 791-2270

Ride is a staff development program designed to assist elementary teachers accommodate individual differences within the regular classroom. RIDE incorporates effective schools practices (based on research), a School Wide Assistance Team, and a Tactics Bank/ Video Library (a computerized resource center). The building team helps teachers intervene with problems which previously prompted special education referral. Through video tapes, teachers receive demonstrations of various social and academic intervention "tactics." Training can be directed to an entire staff or to teams who can in turn train other staff. Equipment (Apple computers, videotape players) and training have been funded through a grant from the Foundation for Children with Learning Disabilities. Evaluation in 6 pilot schools documents a decrease in special education referrals, a savings of \$6000 per year per building in special education assessment costs, and increased psychological services regarding consultation and intervention. Materials are available from Sopris West, Inc., PO Box 1809, Longmont, CO 80502; (303) 651-2859.

NEW YORK

Less Restrictive Placement: Building Networks Project

NYC Board of Education

110 Livingston St

Brooklyn, NY 11201

Contact: Dr. Beth Bernstein (212) 533-1440

The Less Restrictive Placement: Building Networks project is a federally funded staff development program designed to improve and increase communication between special and general education staff in order to promote successful transitions of students to less restrictive settings. Through a series of process-oriented workshops, special and regular education staff explore classroom expectations, learning styles, social integration skills, and feelings of teachers and students in the transition process. Costs are limited to the salary for the project coordinator. Interviews and surveys of participants indicate the program has promoted a more positive atmosphere between special and regular education staff and better communication. The full evaluation report can be obtained from the Office of Assessment at the project address. Videotapes and an implementation guide are also available.

NORTH DAKOTA

The Child Study Team

Prairie View Elementary School

Devils Lake, ND 58301

Contact: Ron Bommersbach (701) 662-4619

The Child Study Team is a building-based referral and problem solving unit composed of teachers, specialists, and an administrator. A series of follow-up meetings is held to evaluate the student's progress and to plan further interventions as needed. Students are referred for special education services only after the team has suggested alternatives and if they deem it necessary. No additional staff/costs are necessary. Staff consultation, forms, and guidelines are available.

OHIO

Chesapeake West Elementary Building Level Teams

PO Box 358

Chesapeake, OH 45619

Contact: Ken Smith (614) 867-3135

BLT is a differentiated referral procedure intended to improve student achievement within the regular classroom, thus reducing special education referrals. The BLT provides support to the classroom teacher through enhancing teacher skills in assessing and describing student behavior, assisting in developing program modifications, and providing ongoing consultation. Staff development and dissemination of resources are additional goals. The team includes the referring teacher, peer teachers, Chapter I teacher, principal, school psychologist, and other staff as needed. Each grade level has its own team which meets monthly at this rural K-4 school. Information evaluation indicates that the BLT has indeed reduced the referrals for special education evaluation.

OHIO

Multidisciplinary Team Decision Process
Vandalia-Butler City Schools
306 S. Dixie Drive
Vandalia, OH 45377

Contact: Stephen R. Grant, School Psychologist (513) 898-4618

Teams, acting as both a pre-and post-referral intervention system, meet weekly to review special education referrals, possible retentions, curriculum and instructional changes, behavioral consultations, and all placement decisions. Schools select their own teams with the school psychologist, speech pathologist, and building administrator being required at all sites. The program was funded by a special grant from the Ohio Department of Education and has been recognized as an exemplary program by the state of Ohio. Program evaluation is in progress.

PENNSYLVANIA

Consultation/Screening Model
ARIN Intermediate Unit
Box 175, Route 422
Shelocta, PA 15774

Contact: Dr. Donna K. Smith (412) 334-3111

Students are referred to the guidance counselor by filling out a Consultation Form identifying basic information. The guidance counselor collects all relevant data, completes the Prereferral/Consultation Form, and convenes a meeting of the P/C Team consisting of classroom teachers, administrators, and support staff. Suggestions and recommendations are generated; time lines are established; and the guidance counselor generally monitors follow-up. Available school staff are utilized. No formal evaluation of the program has been completed.

WISCONSIN

Dept of Curriculum/Instruction
Box 413
University of Wisconsin/ Milwaukee
Milwaukee, WI 53201

Contact: Marleen Pugach
(414) 229-4814

ALABAMA

Peer Collaboration

Area of Social Education
PO Box 2592
University of Alabama
Tuscaloosa, AL 35487

Contact: Lawrence Johnson
(205) 348-1444

Peer collaboration is an interactive method of problem solving based on the assumption that general education teachers can develop effective instructional and behavioral interventions by working together. Teachers work in pairs following a systematic, highly structured dialogue based on a series of metacognitive strategies. Teachers work towards a greater understanding of problems in the classroom before attempting interventions. Teachers receive training in peer collaboration procedures and the roles of "initiator" and "facilitator." The four steps of peer collaboration include 1) problem description and clarification, 2) summarizing the problem, 3) developing at least three potential interventions and predicting outcomes, and 4) developing practical evaluation strategies.

The effectiveness of peer collaboration is currently being investigated at elementary school sites in Alabama, Illinois and Wisconsin. Preliminary findings indicate that teachers consider classroom problems more constructively and objectively, that teachers perceive immediate and positive results in the classroom, and that teachers can better recognize their capabilities for problem solving. Finally, it appears that peer collaboration decreases the teachers' dependency upon special education and frees special educators to work more intensively with students who truly need their expertise.

References:

Pugach, M., & Johnson, L. (1988, Spring). Peer collaboration. Teaching Exceptional Children, 75-77.

Chapter Six

Alternative Mental Health/Support Services

This chapter includes a variety of programs providing support services to students, parents and families. These range from a comprehensive model of mental health services in school and community to classroom-based student support programs to a parent resource center. Generally, support staff such as the school psychologist, counselor, or social worker are essential staff providing services. What differentiates these programs from the many mental health services available in school settings is their emphasis on meeting the needs of handicapped and at-risk students within a regular education system, and reducing the probability that these students will need restrictive placements.

Program Entries:

*Minnesota: Friendly Universe

*New York: Primary Mental Health Project

Maryland: The Fourth R: Relationship Skills

Ohio: Inservice: Enhancing Teacher Effectiveness

Oregon: Parent Education Resource Center

Rhode Island: Warwick Parent/Child Counseling Program

MINNESOTA

Friendly Universe

Address: South Elementary School
1120 15th Avenue South
St. Cloud, MN 56301

Phone: (612) 253-9333
251-1322

Director: Dr. James Henning, Assistant Director of Special Education and
Mr. Bill Challen, Building Principal

Contact: Deb Forstner and Lynn Bye
South Elementary School (612) 251-1322

Funding: State funds, no additional funds beyond normal school budget.

Target Population: Urban elementary school children, grades K-6. 850 students, general education and special education students, are served by this program, along with a pool of 498 nonpublic school students who, upon referral, are provided with special education assessment services.

Program Description: The purpose of this program is to respond to a need expressed by teaching staff for increased support services in an elementary school of 850 students. In the Fall of 1985, a full-time school psychologist and social worker were assigned to this school. The support staff formulated a mission for the school year, using the rationale that while South Elementary is only a small part of the universe, interventions aimed at the development of interpersonal relations, increased self-esteem, and effective education could possibly have a long-term global effect. A variety of curricula and other intervention methods were employed. This marked an expansion in the role and function of support staff and a change of focus from a reactive model of services to a proactive multidimensional service delivery model. Program implementation includes the following areas:

- 1) Self-esteem, social skills, family change, problem solving and assertiveness curricula; matching curricula to student needs, group management and process strategies, and staff and parent communication during instruction.
- 2) Classroom presentations on topics such as peer pressure, feeling expression, social skills, and problem solving.
- 3) Individual work with students, including behavior contracting, self-esteem building, goal-setting.
- 4) Building-wide programming to increase positive student behavior such as time-out program with reality therapy components, Courtesy Week, and noon hour awards for positive behavior.
- 5) Efforts to increase staff knowledge on a variety of topics through techniques such as inservice programs, monthly bulletin boards, weekly self-concept sheets, and classroom presentations.
- 6) A support team consisting of teacher representatives from each grade level, the building principal, school nurse, school social worker, and school psychologist. This group utilized strategies for goal-setting, team building, and numerous building-wide interventions.
- 7) Techniques for promoting use of community agencies for parents, students, and staff.
- 8) Curricula and materials used for parent information and parent groups.

Referral Procedure: For system-wide interventions, all students in the school may be included, depending upon grade level and developmental needs. Teacher, parent, agency and self-referrals are used for small group and individual interventions. The decision to work directly with a child is based on the outcome of a problem solving interview conducted with the referring agent; previous interventions are reviewed and future strategies determined.

Personnel Required: One school psychologist and one school social worker work with 850 public school students. Additional support is given by assessment team psychologists who conducted 57 ability assessments for the school population in the 1985-86 school year.

Costs: Personnel: .18 of normal salary per support staff person (after state and school district special education reimbursement)

Equipment: \$400 (new curricula, etc.)

Training: existing materials for teacher inservice and parent group.

Special Equipment/Material: None

Evaluation Plan/Results: Multi-dimensional evaluation has included pre/post student intervention rating scales and observations; pre/post staff satisfaction surveys; parent/student evaluation of groups; assessment of effectiveness of inservice goals (completed by participants). Results of evaluation studies are available. A pre/post assessment of staff's perception of importance and quality of support staff services found that 79.5% of the staff (with a 100% survey return rate) indicated a positive direction of change in how well services have been provided. Overall, the function showing the most change in both importance and quality of service delivery was: "Provides self-esteem and social skills classes to students". On pre-post analysis of teacher completed evaluations of students involved in interventions, there was a positive direction of change. One of the staff inservice programs received the highest rating by participants of any inservice in the Special Education Department's history to that point.

Special Materials/Equipment: None

Replication/Implementation Information: Evaluation results are available at printing cost. Informational packets for program development and implementation are available for purchase. Instruction materials include program development (i.e., how to introduce new support staff systems into a school building), program implementation, including a variety of special curricula and intervention techniques. Consultants will travel to a new site at a cost of \$150/hour for a team of two consultants.

References/Publications: Informational packets for program development and implementation. Contact Deb Forstner or Lynn Bye.

NEW YORK

Primary Mental Health Project

Address: Center for Community Study
University of Rochester
57 Mt. Hope Ave
Rochester, NY 14620

Phone: (716) 275-2548

Director: Dr. Emory Cowen

Contact: William Haffey or A. Dirk Hightower

Funding: Local, state and private funding

Target Population: K-6 handicapped and at-risk students in urban, suburban, and rural New York state (approximately 88 school districts)

Program Description: Primary Mental Health Project is a non-profit organization serving elementary school children through early detection, prevention of adjustment problems, specific small group programs to help children learn to cope with stress, and classroom programs for teachers to use to help children learn problem solving and adaptive skills. Services in each school are coordinated by a PMHP team (psychologist, social worker, and paraprofessionals). Child-Aides provide ongoing support to students and receive intensive training and supervision. Behavioral goals are determined through conferences with teachers and parents. Interventions include time-limited individual and group activities and crisis intervention.

Referral Procedures: Children are referred by teachers and parents, with multiple sources of information used to determine appropriateness of service. All first graders are screened using a teacher rating scale, support staff observations, and children's drawings. Further assessment is completed for students who appear to be at-risk based on screening.

Personnel Required: Per school, half-day per week mental health professional (psychologist, social worker, counselor), 1 paraprofessional per 100 primary students, one program consultant per 20 schools.

Costs: Variable depending upon personnel needed; evaluation costs 40 cent per pupil.

Special Materials/Equipment: Manuals, testing materials, training materials, etc.

Evaluation Plan/Results: This program has been widely researched over the past 30 years, and is ongoing through the University of Rochester. In addition to schools in the Rochester area, the program has been replicated in 20 other districts. From 25 internal studies and a number of external evaluations, program efficacy has been demonstrated in terms of the reduction of children's school problem behaviors and enhancement of school competencies. A full bibliography of these evaluation studies can be obtained from the project.

Replication Information: An information packet is available free on request. An annual workshop is scheduled in November. Consultation and training are available. Contact William Haffey for further information about training and site visits.

References/ Publications: A list is available from the project directors.

MARYLAND

The Fourth R: Relationship Skills
The National Institute for Relationship Training
9240 Broken Timber Way
Columbia, MD 21045-2310

Contact: Dr. Richard Solomon (301) 730-5500

The Fourth R: Relationship Skills is a program for teaching relationship skills to students who have difficulty managing their own behavior and getting along with others. The program covers 39 relationship skills presented in a developmental sequence, including starting and stopping conversation, listening, showing acceptance and rejection through body language, asserting and defending yourself, and becoming an effective group member. On pre/post measures, students have shown marked improvement in social skills. More formal evaluation is underway. Inservice training at a daily or hourly rate is available, as are handbooks for teaching relationship skills.

OHIO

**Inservice: Enhancing Teacher Effectiveness
Through Increased Self Awareness**
Indian Hill Schools
6205 Drake Rd
Cincinnati, OH 45243

Contact: Barbara Voelkel (513) 561-5211

School psychologists co-lead inservice workshops designed to address specific teacher needs (i.e. management styles, stress management). Techniques include the use of standardized instruments and inventories, verbal and written feedback to participants, and follow-up consultation. Normal school budgets are sufficient. Workshop materials can be obtained at nominal cost. Consultation arrangements are negotiable.

OREGON

Parent Education Resource Center
Douglas County School District #4
1419 NW Valley View Dr.
Roseburg, OR 97470

Contact: Mary Gaulke (503) 440-4036

The Parent Education Resource Center (PERC) is a centrally located library of instructional materials for use by parents. Referrals to the on-site Resource Consultant are made by classroom or special education teachers. PERC staff then provide parents with assistance in selecting materials appropriate for their child, and in the instructional use of the materials. A list of the distributed materials is then sent to the classroom teacher. Materials may also be checked out over the summer. Parents, school staff, and students have reacted positively to the program. A packet of materials about the project is available on request.

RHODE ISLAND

Warwick Public Schools Parent/Child Counseling Program

34 Warwick Lake Av
Warwick, RI 02889

Contact: Richard D. Lloyd (401) 737-3300 ext. 210

The Parent/Child Counseling Program utilizes existing school staff (school psychologists, counselors, special education teachers) to provide parent and child counseling services during after school hours. Children referred to the program may be in regular or special education, aged preschool through grade 6, who exhibit social and/or behavioral difficulties in school. Parent and children groups are run concurrently. The children's groups are divided by age into groups of six to ten children, with two therapists, and emphasize social skills development through direct group play. The parent education groups follow the Systematic Training for Effective Parenting (STEP) program. Federal funds and other grants support this program. Nonpublished outcome reports are available.

Reference:

Dinkmeyer, D. & McKay, G. (1983). Systematic Training for Effective Parenting. Circle Pines, MN: American Guidance Services.

Chapter Seven

Alternative Early Intervention Programs

This chapter includes a variety of model preschool programs which emphasize integration, mainstream opportunities, and prevention. Some, such as the Discovery Kindergarten Program, are designed to prevent the development of more serious and handicapping conditions as children grow older. Several programs actively integrate handicapped and nonhandicapped preschoolers and kindergarten children. Others add a community outreach and consultation component to increase communication across agencies and provide broader integration experiences. One program (Preschool Transition Project) specifically addresses the transition of handicapped preschoolers into mainstream public school settings.

Program Entries:

*Minnesota: Project Dakota Outreach

*North Carolina: Discovery Kindergarten Program

*Utah: Preschool Transition/Social Integration

*Virginia: Hampton University Mainstreaming Project

Illinois: Beethoven Project

Kansas: Planning School Transitions

Kansas: Kidlink Preschool

Massachusetts: Early Recognition Intervention Network

New York: Jowonio: The Learning Place

Ohio: Kindergarten Intervention Program

Ohio: Positive Education Program's Early Intervention Centers

Utah: Functional Mainstreaming for Success

MINNESOTA

Project Dakota Outreach

Address: Dakota Inc.
680 O'Neill Dr.
Eagan, MN 55121

Phone: (612) 455-2335

Director: Linda Kjerland

Contact: Same

Funding: Federal grant: HCEEP Outreach (Handicapped Children's Early Education Program) through September, 1987

Target Population: Preschool children with at least a 20% delay in one or more area; handicapped or high risk; suburban and small town service area. Model program serves 31 students; 300 students served by agency.

Program Description: The goal of Project Dakota is to assist the family and community, promote optimal development of preschoolers and reduce the negative effects of delay or disability. Specific goals include a high degree of parent involvement in planning and intervention, training parents and other caregivers, and increasing the child's ability to function in less restrictive environments via natural settings and resources. A transdisciplinary team model was selected because it could be easily transferred across agencies and settings, involved ongoing staff development, and provided continuity between parents and staff, and programs and children.

The program begins with a plan for assessment developed with the parents, followed by the assessment itself. Strengths and weaknesses of the child are identified, and with the family, priorities for intervention are established. Family and staff then select appropriate service options, which include home-based services, center-based services (play groups, intervention groups, peer tutor, family supports), and/or community-based services which include integrated preschool sites. Most families are involved in all three settings. Project Dakota was an HCEEP demonstration site from 1983-1986, and in 1986, included 10 outreach sites for training and technical assistance.

Referral Procedure: Preschool children with handicaps or at risk for disability who reside in Dakota County are eligible for services from Dakota, Inc.; must have a 20% delay identified in at least one area of development; known risk conditions such as Down Syndrome or cerebral palsy.

Personnel Required: Direct service team includes early childhood special education teacher, occupational therapist, speech clinician, part-time family service counselor, part-time program assistant.

Evaluation Plan/Results: Evaluation has included parent satisfaction survey, measures of child gains, parent participation rates in IEP progress, rate of child participation with nondelayed peers, use of natural settings, community referral rates; final project report is available from the director. Briefly, all children in project have contact at least part of the week with nondelayed peers, averaging 18.5 hours per week in May of 1986. Actual developmental gains for project children have been substantially higher than average gains from other preschool programs reported in 45 recent studies. The vast majority of IEP goals are generated by parents, and only 4% of all strategies are carried out by staff alone, while over 40% are carried out by families alone. Families are referred to an average of 8.5 community resources including respite care, financial assistance, diagnostic and counseling clinics, and early childhood programs.

Replication/Implementation: Free training materials are available. Consultation is available for \$75/hour, with free orientation sessions and travel by consultants. Internships are available for rural service providers, and a library is available for on-site use. Leadership seminars and workshops are available. Travel and training costs have been subsidized by grants. Contact program director or

training coordinator for information. (Funding changes after September, 1987 will require cost adjustments.)

References/Publications:

"Project Dakota: Early Intervention Tailor-Made" (10 page booklet).

Kovach and Kjerland (1987). Final Report Project Dakota: 1983-86.

"Structures for Program Responsiveness to Parents." (9 page monograph with references)

(Above publications and costs are available from the project director)

NORTH CAROLINA

Discovery Kindergarten Program

Address: Goldsboro City Schools
Post Office Drawer 1797
Goldsboro, NC 27533

Phone: (919) 731-5900

Director: Dr. Craig L. McFadden

Funding: Local school district grant

Target Population: High risk kindergarten students

Program Description: The Discovery Kindergarten Program is designed to function as an effective, low-cost early intervention strategy. Developmentally-delayed kindergarten children who are "at-risk" for kindergarten or first grade failure are the target population. At-risk" students are identified through an intensive kindergarten screening program administered two weeks prior to the first week of school. The Discovery program participants are involved in an alternative, developmentally-oriented kindergarten class for the school year. The program is intended to provide an additional year of maturation in an enriched environment. The children progress to the more academically-oriented, regular kindergarten curriculum the following school year.

Educationally, the Discovery Kindergarten Program contains very little direct instruction. Rather, the environment is structured so that educational goals are met through the child's instinctive motive to play. As proposed by Piaget's theories and inherent in Montessori's methods, the child's free access to a planned environment maintains motivation and allows for individually paced education.

Referral Procedure: Teacher and parent referral as well as extensive screening procedure two weeks prior to the first week of school. The screening instrument is normed locally. Children 1.5 standard deviations below the mean are eligible. Identified Educable Mentally Handicapped students are excluded.

Personnel Required: Each class of 20 has 1 teacher and 1 teacher assistant. Necessary for evaluation and consultation: psychologist, speech/language therapist, and physical therapist.

Costs: Personnel: regular allotted teachers and assistants
Equipment: \$3,000 per class 1st year -\$1,00 per class following years.
Training: psychologist, speech/language therapist, physical therapist.
Screening: \$3,000 (stipend for kindergarten teachers)

Special Materials/Equipment: Preschool and kindergarten equipment and materials.

Evaluation Plan/Results: Experimental results indicated that the Discovery childrens attained a higher level of general development, were better adapted to a school environment, and were more highly motivated to achieve in school than similar students in regular kindergarten classes. The measure of achievement motivation was found to contribute most to the overall significance. No significant difference was obtained between the two groups on the measure of academic readiness for first grade, with neither group prepared to enter into the first grade curriculum. By design, however, the Discovery students were to enter the kindergarten program the following school year, whereas the control students were expected to enter the first grade. During the second year of the program, teacher observations suggest that the Discovery graduates are performing well in the regular kindergarten program and should progress to first grade with few difficulties. Longitudinal data are currently being analyzed.

Replication/Implementation: A brief description of the program is available free, "How to" materials will be available at duplicating cost, and the Program Evaluation is available from the University Microfilms International (see below). Consultation available from staff for expenses and compensation for missed work. "Why" and "how to" workshop has been developed.

References/Publications:

McFadden, C. L. Discovery Kindergarten Program: An Alternative Approach for Developmentally Delayed Kindergarten Children. Available from University Microfilms International.

UTAH

Preschool Transition Project/Utah Social Integration

Address: Outreach Division, DCHP
Utah State University
Logan, UT 84322-6800

Phone: (801) 750-1991

Director: Sarah Rule

Contact: Same

Funding: State funds

Target Population: Handicapped and high risk preschool and kindergarten children in the urban and suburban Salt Lake City area; training is also offered to teachers and parents.

Program Description: The Preschool Transition Project and Social Integration Program serve handicapped children in mainstream day care centers and prepare them for continued mainstreaming when they enroll in elementary school. Special education staff are responsible for screening, assessment, IEP development and programming, as well as training day care staff. The project has developed a social skills curricula, "Let's Be Social," and "Skills for School Success" to train mainstream survival skills. The program components (e.g., social skills curricula) can be implemented by agencies in different service delivery settings. Staff training is offered in implementing curricula, individualizing instruction, training aides and volunteers, and administrative procedures related to coordinating mainstream placements. The Social Integration model integrates children socially as well as physically into early education programs, and provides a support system to enable regular classroom staff to implement model components (service delivery, basic skill instruction, social skills instruction, home support). While funding has been terminated, information and materials are still available for the program director.

Referral Procedures: All children must be referred through the Utah Department of Social Services, and meet state criteria as handicapped. Referrals may be initiated by teachers, parents or agencies. Physical status must be consistent with mainstream services.

Personnel Required: One half-time special education teacher per 8-9 handicapped children; one half-time aide per 8-9 children; mainstream staff ratios in compliance with state licensing rules; specialists on consulting basis (speech, psychologist, occupational therapists, etc.) as dictated by student needs. The transition component (Skills for School Success) requires only one special education teacher for 8-9 handicapped children and can be implemented with commercially available preschool materials and curricula.

Costs: \$15 per child per day beyond normal day care fees

Special Materials/Equipment: Curriculum developed by program ("Let's Be Social" and "Skill for School Success")

Evaluation Plan/Results: Studies have been conducted comparing program students with comparable handicapped students in self-contained programs, Head Start, and with nonhandicapped children, using a variety of measures. Pre- and post-tests in various skill areas have also been used to document progress. Students make significant gains over pre-test, comparable to students in self-contained and Head Start; performance on criterion-referenced testing is only surpassed by nonhandicapped children. See references for additional information. Over half of the program graduates have been placed in regular education classrooms for elementary school, about one-third have been placed in self-contained special education classes. Relative to self-contained preschool programs, project students receive more program time at a lower per pupil cost.

Replication/Implementation: Three sites in the Salt Lake City area are replicating this model. Consultation and training are available from the program staff. Replication training involves training sessions in relevant project components, with follow-up provided by trainers in classrooms wherever possible. Audio teleconferencing is used for follow-up consultation. Visits can be arranged at the project site by contacting the Project Director. Program materials are available at printing cost to trainees. Training costs are shared by the project and replication site.

References/Publications:

Rule, S., Stowitschek, J., Innocenti, M., Striefel, S., & Boswell, C. (1985). Training and support for mainstream day care staff. Early Child Development and Care, 20, 99-113.

Rule, S., Stowitschek, J., Innocenti, M., Striefel, S., Killoran, J., & Swezey, K. (1987). The Social Integration Program: An analysis of the effects of mainstreaming handicapped children into day care centers. Education and Treatment of Children, 10, 175-192.

"Let's Be Social" and "Skills for School Success" curricula are available from Outreach and Development Division, Developmental Center for Handicapped Persons, Utah State University, Logan UT 84322-6805. Introductory materials including an outreach brochure are also available on request.

VIRGINIA

Hampton University Mainstreaming Project

Address: Hampton University
Hampton, VA 23668

Phone: (804) 727-5751
or 727-5533

Director: Marie S. Shelton

Contact: Same

Funding: Federal HCEEP Outreach (Handicapped Children's Early Education program) initial grant; Hampton University via Early Child Development Laboratory School.

Target Population: Young handicapped and at-risk children and their families from urban, suburban, small town, rural areas; 10-12 handicapped children currently served, aged 20 months to six years, from 2-5 school district areas near the Tidewater area of Virginia. The Outreach program is aimed at regular and special education teachers and administrators statewide seeking to replicate the mainstream model.

Program Description: The Hampton program has two components, the model intervention program and the outreach program. The Mainstream model fully integrates children with developmental delays into nursery, preschool and kindergarten programs with nonhandicapped peers. The goal is to provide quality service to handicapped children and their families from traditionally underrepresented minority communities. Initially a HCEEP model project 9 years ago, the program is now fully funded through Hampton University. Major components include 1) child find services to culturally diverse children via screening in familiar settings; 2) mainstream preparation including assessment of prospective classrooms, child readiness, and identification of procedures to support mainstream placements; 3) mainstream implementation including individualized planning and documentation of progress via a team approach and consultation from resource teachers; resource services to children are provided within the classroom objectives integrated into classroom activities; 4) parent involvement in assessment, IEP, and evaluation, as well as other family activities; 5) negotiated agreements between staff and agencies regarding their roles and responsibilities.

The mainstreaming Outreach program is in its sixth year of HCEEP funding to provide training and technical assistance needed to implement the mainstream model. It assists statewide target agencies in replicating model components, prepares awareness instructional and training materials, and helps coordinate services among state, regional and national groups. Training initiatives include intensive team training for local agencies preparing to replicate the mainstream model; a statewide mainstreaming course for public school, Head Start, day care and infant program staff and parents; consultation and materials regarding the model; practicum in the mainstream resource-consultant role; interagency administrative roundtables regarding early childhood special education issues.

Referral Procedure: Teachers, parents and agencies refer children with developmental delays. Screening and evaluation indicate delays of 25% in at least one area. Appropriateness of placement is determined by a trial placement and observation using project-developed instruments.

Personnel Required: For model program - 1 mainstream resource teacher, 5 early childhood classroom teachers, 2 classroom assistants, 1 speech/language clinician, consultants (psychologists, pediatrician, O.T., social worker)

Costs: Personnel - \$35,000 (resource teacher, 2 classroom assistants)
Materials, tests, training funds are contributed

Special Materials/Equipment: Video camera

Evaluation Plan/ Results: Project evaluation report to grant agency is available from Project Director. Internal evaluation has considered parent satisfaction, staff satisfaction, child progress, and subsequent school placements. Briefly, handicapped children's development is enhanced, particularly in social and adaptive functioning; parents report positive change in children's self-confidence and independence; staff view efforts to integrate handicapped children as positive.

Replication/Implementation: Training and technical assistance are available at no charge within Virginia; out of state consultation is available at cost of travel and lodging. The Outreach program has a number of training procedures geared to replication sites. A number of materials have been developed and are available at cost from the Director. Site visits can be arranged.

References/Publications:

- "Very Important Preliminary Steps for Mainstreaming"
- "Resource Services in the Classroom? Yes! In the Classroom!"
- "Preparing for Transition: A tool for Teachers"
- "Cultural Diversity and Awareness Inventory"
- "Beyond Yes or No: The Vulpe Performance Analysis System"
- "Individualizing Instruction in the Preschool Environment" (Videotape)

These materials are available from the Project Director at Hampton University. "Cultural Diversity" includes extensive list of references.

ILLINOIS

Beethoven Project
Center for Successful Child Development
Robert Taylor Homes
Chicago, IL

Contact: Gina Barclay McLaughlin

The "Beethoven Project" is a constellation of social, medical and educational services for children birth to age five in the nation's largest public housing project. A major goal is to enhance the early school success of a high-risk population of children born into very poor, mostly single-parent households. Initially funded through the Chicago Urban League, the Ounce of Prevention Fund, and a variety of federal and private foundations, the project is currently the model for federally funded "Comprehensive Child Development Projects." The core of the program is a team of family advocates, generally women from the community who have received special training. Women in their first trimester of pregnancy are identified, receive home visits offering support, child development information, and community referrals as needed. A drop-in center with toys and child care support is also available; parents can take a variety of classes while children are supervised. Primary medical services are also offered for adults and children.

Through collaboration with community agencies, the Beethoven Project also includes a state-funded program for pregnant teens and teen parents, a job training program, a substance-abuse prevention program for preschoolers and their families, grants to elementary teachers at the community school for innovative practices, and cultural activities. Collaboration with the neighborhood school staff is considered an essential component, to assure continued success for the project's children once they enter public school. Participation has been one measure of the program's success-- nearly all families who become involved remain with the program as long as they live in the area. A longitudinal study of participants has been proposed for funding.

KANSAS

Planning School Transitions: Family and Professional Collaboration
Bureau of Child Research
University of Kansas
1318 Louisiana St.
Lawrence, KS 66045

Contact: Dr. Thomas Johnson
(913) 864-3050

This is a research-oriented program aimed at helping schools and families plan school transitions for young handicapped children moving from special preschool settings into less restrictive school placements. The program emphasizes advanced planning and communication between sending and receiving programs, and the home. The model includes a format for intra-agency agreements, communicating between home and school, family involvement in decision making, program and mainstream transition timelines, preparation for change in programs, and evaluation of transitions. This demonstration project has been supported by federal grants. Information about grant funding, and materials developed by the project are available on request. Evaluation of the program's effectiveness is underway.

KANSAS

Kidlink Preschool: A Reverse Mainstreaming Preschool

The Capper Foundation
3500 W. 10th St.
Topeka, KS 66604

Contact: Debra Langston Brant (913) 272-4060

Kidlink Preschool is an integrated preschool program serving handicapped (physically and neurologically impaired), and nonhandicapped children. The program offers programming five days per week in four integrated classrooms, where children have opportunities to interact with peers of varying developmental levels. Individual therapies are scheduled as needed for handicapped students, with nonhandicapped peers included in sessions to serve as models. The program also includes a parent program, a parent library, and a toy lending library. Initial funding was supported by a federal grant; current funding is from state and private sources. An evaluation and formal report will be forthcoming (contact the project director). A manual describing this interdisciplinary approach to preschool programs is available from the Capper Foundation at cost.

MASSACHUSETTS

Early Recognition Intervention Network (ERIN)

376 Bridge St
Dedham, MA 02026

Contact: Peter Hainsworth (617) 329-5529

ERIN is a set of assessment tools, curriculum guides, and hands-on materials to help teachers organize and enhance any early childhood education program. It is cognitively oriented and developmentally based as well as diagnostic-prescriptive. ERIN can be used with both handicapped and nonhandicapped children in mainstream settings and with seriously handicapped children in special classes and home-based services. There is an extensive set of publications including bilingual materials (18+ languages); assessment materials include the preschool Screening System and the Developmental Inventory of Learned Skills. ERIN has been evaluated by the Joint Dissemination Review Panel of the U.S. Office of Education (1978, 1984). Mainstream and handicapped children showed gains on the McCarthy GCI and on measures of information processing and readiness.

NEW YORK

Jowonio: The Learning Place
215 Bassett St.
Syracuse, NY 13210

Contact: Alice M. Brogan (315) 479-7744

Jowonio is a preschool program for nonhandicapped and seriously disabled children. For the disabled child, the school offers a therapeutic setting in which special needs can be addressed individually, and in groups with typical peers. For all the children, the school offers individualized teaching with an emphasis on social and emotional development as well as cognitive or academic learning. One-third of the school's total student population of 85 is disabled. Children's attitudes towards each other are being measured in an effort to understand the degree of social integration achieved in the program. Funding is provided by tuition payments; (handicapped children tuitioned from Onandaga County Health Department, non-handicapped tuition by parents).

OHIO

Kindergarten Intervention Program
Highland Local Schools
Sparta, OH 43550

Contact: Lew Sarr (419) 946-7070
Morrow County Public Schools
27 W. High St.
Mt. Gilead, OH 43338

This program provides services to kindergarten children who demonstrate that they are "high risk" for retention and/or special education referral. Students are identified in October through use of the Kindergarten Diagnostic Inventory and teacher referral. The program starts in November. During individual and small group sessions of 10-20 minutes, activities that involve a combination of auditory, visual, and kinesthetic modalities are used to teach basic concepts, letters, numbers, sequencing, and listening skills. Parents serve as the delivery people, working individually with a student or with small groups of three or four students. Costs for the program include \$100 for educational toys and for programs that match the assessment, and \$230-430 for the test kit, protocols, and a software program to develop norms (optional). A training manual is available at cost from the program director.

OHIO

Positive Education Program's Early Intervention Centers

Positive Education Program
1827 E. 101st. Street
Cleveland, OH 44106

Contact: Ann Bowdish (216) 231-0400

This program provides a wide range of services to families with pre-school handicapped children, including: classroom experiences for children and their parents; daily, individualized parent/child training sessions; parent theory classes; multi-factored evaluation of children; on-going data collection and informal assessment of both child and parent change; and, liaison placement and follow-up services with other agencies. The goal of the program is to enable preschool handicapped children to acquire the adaptive behaviors and developmental skills which are prerequisites for placement in less restrictive educational settings when they enter school. The importance of parents and families in the roles of primary mediators of early learning and adjustment is given primary emphasis. The program is housed in two centers and serves approximately 175 children per year. It is a replication of the Regional Intervention Program in Nashville, Tennessee.

Federal and state funds, United Way, and an allocation from the Community Mental Health Board support the program. Annual evaluations indicate much parent satisfaction, reduction in the percentage of children needing special education in later years, and very low staff turn-over. Evaluation information can be obtained from: The Regional Intervention Program 2400 White Avenue, Nashville, Tenn. 37204. Parent education materials on behavior management skills, and communication skills and a trainer's handbook are available from Dr. Mary Lynn Cantrell, Director of Training and Dissemination. Information regarding the formal training program can also be obtained from Dr. Cantrell.

UTAH

Functional Mainstreaming for Success

Education Unit
Developmental Center for Handicapped Persons
Utah State University
Logan, UT 84322

Contact: Dr. Sebastian Striefel (801) 750-2013

The FMS project serves children ages 3 to 6 years, with and without handicaps. The project is based on the philosophy that successful mainstreaming is the planned, systematic physical, social, and instructional integration of a child into a program which is most functional for that child. All students with handicaps are integrated into normalized settings to the fullest extent possible, as dictated by the child's individual needs. The program therefore, strives to mainstream children by the use of three models: total reverse mainstreaming, partial mainstreaming, and systematic transistioning to less restrictive locations. Ten disciplines are represented on the staff in order to assure appropriate individualized programs for each child served. The program also serves as a preservice training site for students from several university departments. Annual evaluations of the program indicate consumer satisfaction and good progress for children, pending individualized program service. A number of documents are available at cost from the program. Due to cuts in funds and new state mandates, some of the mainstreaming components were discontinued in 1988. However, outreach activities and partial replications continue.

Chapter Eight

Integration/Transition Programs

Most of the programs presented in earlier chapters address services and support systems for mildly handicapped and at-risk students. This chapter presents models for more fully integrating severely handicapped students into the mainstream of regular education or the community. Included are a team teaching model for nonhandicapped/trainable retarded students, a program integrating physically handicapped students, a support system for hearing impaired students, and a vocationally oriented transition model for graduating high school handicapped students.

The underlying assumption of these programs is normalization- that handicapped individuals make better life adjustments when their education and training take place in settings where "normal" behaviors are modeled and taught. There are a variety of approaches to integration, including team teaching, peer tutoring, parallel instruction, etc. Some of the cooperative learning and cooperative teaching strategies addressed in earlier chapters can be effective in integrating groups with more severely handicapped students. Positive outcomes have been documented for nonhandicapped, as well as handicapped, students participating in integrated educational settings.

Program Entries:

*Ohio: Project MARCS

California: Listen and Learn

Minnesota: Putman Team Teaching Model

Minnesota: District 287 Physically Handicapped Program

Minnesota: Simley High School Transition Program

OHIO

Project MARCS

Address: Putnam County Office of Education
Courthouse Annex
Ottawa, OH 45875

Phone: (419) 523-5951

Director: Daniel VonderEmose, Jan Osborn, Linda Graves

Contact: Same

Funding: No additional funds beyond normal school budget; federal grant: Follow-Through

Target Population: Preschool and elementary school (grades K-4) children, hearing impaired children in regular classrooms. The project serves 800 students in approximately 40 classrooms in 11 schools.

Program Description: Project MARCS (Mainstream Amplification Regular Classroom Study) is a preventive intervention strategy for classroom instruction enhancement. Targeting lower elementary children, sound field amplification improves the quality and consistency of oral instruction. Children are thus better able to compensate for a high incidence of otitis media, auditory processing difficulties, and the "back row" effect. In each classroom, the teacher wears a small wireless microphone and transmitter which sends a signal to a receiver/amplified with two speakers, usually located in the back of the classroom. The teacher's voice is amplified 10 decibels louder than the normal voice level. No other modifications are made within the classroom and the teacher is not asked to change any methods, strategies, or curriculum. Other students may also use the microphone for activities such as "show and tell."

Referral Procedures: All students in school/grade are included.

Personnel Required: Other than regular teachers using the amplification, other personnel have only been used for screening, assessment of results, and dissemination of information.

Costs: Approximately \$1650 per classroom for the sound amplification system.

Special Materials/Equipment: Amplification equipment with wireless transmitter/receiver.

Evaluation Plan/Results: An evaluation comparing 17 amplified classrooms to 17 matched control classrooms has been conducted. Assessment measures include the Iowa Test of Basic Skills, full assessment of each child's hearing, formal classroom observations by a trained observer, and administration of the Piers-Harris Self-Concept Scale to older children (4th graders). Hearing screening was stringent, and found failure rate at approximately 43% of initial screening with 20% showing evidence of otitis media. Further testing was done on children who failed the screening. Achievement test results show significantly better listening and language scores on the Iowa's for the amplified group. The younger the student, the greater the differences between the control and experimental groups. Other data are still being analyzed. Parents and teachers are positive about the project. Significantly fewer referrals for special education were received from those schools which employed the most amplification systems. Contact Project Directors for further information about evaluation data.

Replication/Implementation Information: Training seminars can be offered; cost is negotiable and usually includes transportation. Participation in a training seminar is strongly encouraged; however, replication is possible without formal training. Visitors to the site are welcome-contact Project Directors.

References/Publications: Publications available, Fall 1988. Contact Project Directors.

CALIFORNIA

Listen and Learn
19061 Laurel Dr.
Los Gatos, CA 95030

Contact: Marsha Haines (408) 354-5491

Listen and Learn provides support to hearing impaired and deaf children, their parents and teachers. Children who use auditory/verbal modes of learning are placed in their local school, regular education classroom and provided with a credentialed teacher of the hearing impaired to work with them within the classroom structure. The specialist also provides consultation to the classroom teacher. In order to reinforce classroom learning, each student is provided with individual instruction after school hours.

MINNESOTA

Putnam Team Teaching Model
Putnam School
1616 NE Buchanan
Minneapolis, MN 55413

Contact: Eileen Baker (612) 627-3067
Colleen Baumtrog (612) 627-3084

The Putnam Team Teaching Model includes two classrooms (third and fifth grades), each with ten students with moderate to severe mental handicaps (MMH) and approximately twenty regular education students in a full-day, integrated classroom setting, team taught by a special and a regular education teacher, and supported by two paraprofessionals. Initiated in the fall of 1988 by teachers Tim Carton and Tom Haack, students and teachers function as a single class, with a parallel team teaching approach used for academic subjects. Regular education students work in reading and math groups while the MMH students work in functional skills groups within the same classroom environment. Throughout the day, the regular education students serve as peer tutors or cooperative learners, and work with the MMH students on their IEP objectives. The students work as one group in physical education, art, music, media, lunch, and recess, and work together on science projects, social studies lessons, and a chemical abuse prevention program. Teachers and parents report that both regular and special education students have displayed improved social behaviors; positive peer interactions have increased.

Prior to implementing this program, MMH students were served in a special classroom with mainstream interactions limited to home room, specialist activities, and peer tutoring experiences. This program was initiated in the fall of 1988 without additional funding or staffing. Evaluation data, consultation and a videotape are available.

MINNESOTA

District 287 Physically Handicapped Program
Hennepin Technical Institute
1820 N. Xenium Lane
Plymouth, MN 55441

Contact: Laura Keller-Gautsch (612) 553-5651

This program helps physically handicapped students, kindergarten through grade 12, handle regular school schedules. An itinerant team of a teacher of physically handicapped, an occupational therapist, and a physical therapist provides services to the student and home school, including evaluation, modifications of curriculum, use of equipment, and staff inservice. Direct and intensive therapy or instruction are provided when needed. A computer consultant and communication disorders specialist are also available. Other team members including the school psychologist and social worker are provided by the local district. The local district is primarily responsible for the student's educational program, with District 287 services part of the plan. State and local funding, as well as tuition charges, support the program. Consultation is available for a fee.

MINNESOTA

Simley High School Transition Program
2920 80th St. E.
Inver Grove Heights, MN 55075

Contact: Darlene Kluznik

The Simley High School Transition program provides direct instruction in self-care to secondary handicapped students while transitioning from school to work and independent adult living. Support employment with a job-coach at a worksite is phased into independent employment. The funding is through the local district and requires five teachers for each of the sections on independent living and employment skills. Evaluation will focus on rates of completion of vocational training and other post-secondary programs.

Chapter Nine Comprehensive Restructuring of Education

The ultimate goal of "alternative services" is the restructuring and reconceptualization of the full educational system. While programs in the preceding chapters address alternative practices as components of the total school process, the programs in this chapter take a broader systems approach to alternative practices. Project MERGE represents a district-wide comprehensive system of support services directed at regular education, bringing services traditionally available through special education into the total school environment. Iowa's RE-AIM program is directed at improving support service delivery statewide through three modules of training: behavioral intervention, consultation, and curriculum-based assessment. Going even further, the Comprehensive Concept from North Carolina represents a statewide effort to reform educational practices at every level, from support services to instructional methods to classroom climate to school scheduling.

Program Entries:

*Iowa: Relevant Education Assessment and Intervention Model

*North Carolina: The Comprehensive Concept

*Washington: Project MERGE

Arkansas: Restructuring for Higher Order Learning

Maine: Restructuring Schools Project

Massachusetts: Carnegie Schools

New Jersey: The Turning Point: The Plan to Revise Special Education

North Carolina: LEAD Teachers Restructuring Project

Washington: Schools for the 21st Century

IOWA

Relevant Education Assessment and Intervention Model (RE-AIM)

Address: Iowa Department of Education
Bureau of Special Education
Des Moines, IA 50319

Phone: (515) 281-3176

Director: Jeff Grimes

Contact: Dan Reschly (515) 294-1742
Dept. of Psychology
Iowa State University
Ames, IA 50011

Funding: Federal funding through State Education Agency/Federal Evaluation Studies Program, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), Department of Education.

Target Population: This program provides training and support services primarily to school psychologists, social workers, and special education consultants. These professionals are responsible for pre-evaluation interventions, screening referrals, comprehensive evaluations, and re-evaluations for students with learning or behavior problems.

Program Description: RE-AIM is a two-year experiment in developing, implementing, and evaluating alternatives to traditional support and related services. The alternatives are designed to augment current services and to strengthen regular and special education options for children and youth with learning and behavior problems. RE-AIM training modules include Behavioral Consultation, Curriculum-Based Assessment, and Referral Question- Consultative Decision Making. Each module involves a two-day workshop in Area Education Agencies, followed by eight weeks of supervised practice in implementing skills. The training is intended to improve pre-assessment interventions, special education eligibility evaluations, regular and special programming and interventions, re-evaluations, and rate of success in the transition from special to regular education placements.

Behavioral Consultation: BC is a four-stage approach to problem identification, problem analysis, plan implementation and plan evaluation, with the primary role of the consultant to guide the problem solving process. Client-centered interviewing procedures are emphasized. Assessment and intervention for special problem behaviors are included.

Curriculum-Based Assessment: As an alternative to traditional assessments, CBA provides a direct link between what is taught and what is tested by deriving assessment from the regular curriculum. This training will emphasize the use of CBA to determine target skills for intervention, monitoring of student progress, and determining eligibility for special education, and will provide training in teacher interviewing, direct observation of the academic environment, and assessing academic performance.

Referral-Question Consultative Decision Making: This training module develops a closer match between the referral agent's concerns and subsequent assessment and intervention. Assessments which help develop effective interventions to change student behavior or performance are emphasized. Training involves building skills in assessment content, procedures (multi-method) and outcomes (interventions). More specific assessment and interventions are the intended outcomes.

Referral Procedure: Students exhibiting difficulties are referred in the home school by teachers according to school procedures. Area Education Agencies participate in the three training modules over a two-year period as scheduled by project staff.

Personnel Required: Existing related services personnel participate in training (approximately 600 total). Training is provided by national consultants (RE-AIM staff): For behavioral consultation, Dan Reschly and Ann Casey; for curriculum-based assessment, Ed Shapiro and Ed Lentz; and for referral-question, George Batsche and Joe Ullman.

Costs: Total funding is \$118,000 (federal funds and matching state funds) to train 600 professionals. This covers trainers' fees and all materials.

Special Materials/Equipment: None

Evaluation Plan /Results: Evaluation was completed by June, 1988. Effects of the training on students performance, systems, related services, and consumer satisfaction have been analyzed. (Contact Dan Reschly for a report.)

Replication/Implementation: Consultation from the project staff is available, with fees negotiable. Consultants can travel to a potential site and can provide workshops in a variety of settings.

References/Publications: Written materials can be obtained for about \$10 to cover duplicating costs. Contact either Jeff Grimes or Dan Reschly.

NORTH CAROLINA

The Comprehensive Concept

Address: North Carolina Department of Public Instruction
116 W. Edenton Street
Raleigh, North Carolina 27603-1712

Phone: (919) 733-5461

Contact: Mike Occhipinti or Betsy Wright

Funding Sources: Local, state

Target Population: All students, staff, administration

Program Description: The Comprehensive Concept is a plan to restructure personnel resources and time in high schools to serve better the educational and developmental needs of all students by coordinating direct services for at-risk students and promoting a positive school climate. Components include coordination and teaming of all support personnel, identification of at-risk students, assignment of all at-risk students to designated mentors, scheduling and a lengthened school day, reduction of class size, consistent discipline, counseling, and networking of school and community resources. Goals of this model are to improve student self-concept, achievement, and attendance; develop effective, efficient service delivery through coordinated efforts; personalize and individualize educational planning for students; monitor risk factors more closely; integrate subject matter; reduce labeling of at-risk students; and lower class size, dropout rates, and behavioral problems.

Keys to success include commitment of administrators and school staff; access to outside services (work programs, youth-serving agencies, family counseling, community colleges); attention to learning styles of students; and vocational and other school-based counseling. Prevention focuses on caring, individual attention to student needs; flexible scheduling; ongoing monitoring of grades, attendance, and behavior; and frequent parent involvement.

Personnel Required: For each school-Mobile teachers (part-time), students support services coordinator (part-time), part-time counseling, part-time secretary.

Costs: Maximum \$15,000-30,000 additional cost per year depending on existing resources. Schools may find they need no additional resources.

Evaluation Plan/Results: To be developed for statewide effort based on attendance, dropout rate, in-and out-of-school suspensions, and achievement. In an early pilot of this model at Washington High School, N.C., the dropout rate was second lowest in the State for three years (1983-86). The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, (Ohio State University) cited it as one of the top programs in the nation.

Replication: Implementation of the model in high school across the state of N.C. is planned beginning 1989-90. Widespread interest has been shown by school systems.

WASHINGTON

Project MERGE

Address: Olympia School District
Special Services
1113 E. Legion Way
Olympia, WA 98501

Phone: (206) 753-8822

Director: Dr. Stillman Wood (Director of Special Services)

Contact: Michael McDonald (206) 753-8858

Funding Sources: State funds for "Enhancing Instructional Program Options"

Target Population: Elementary students (at-risk, handicapped, low achievers) and staff, parents at 4 school sites.

Program Description: Project MERGE (Maximizing Educational Remediation within General Education) is a building-based team model of service delivery directed towards maintaining students in the regular education classroom through instructional adaptation and consultation. Delivery of support services has been restructured through four basic strategies: 1) serving students with mild behavior and learning problems within the regular classroom, 2) providing a problem solving system using Chalfant's Teacher Assistance Team Model, 3) increasing building-based management and decision-making for low performing students, and 4) directly assisting children with social, behavioral, and emotional problems that negatively affect school performance. Support services and general education have been integrated through building-level teams, a continuum of services for students and teachers, emphasis on service within the regular classroom, and emphasizing instructional variables that promote success within regular education. Support service personnel (including the school psychologist) serve as parent educators, home-school liaisons, and as consultants to regular education staff. While state regulations require categorical reporting and monitoring of handicapped students, Project MERGE minimizes categorical service and labeling, reducing special education referrals and placements.

Personnel: MERGE utilizes existing personnel, but some roles have changed. Support personnel (psychologists, counselors) serve as consultants; support and special education staff provide less assessment and more direct service; regular education teachers serve each other as peer consultants through the Teacher Assistance Team model; reallocation and reassignment of responsibilities allowed the district to replace some psychometrists with social workers and counselors. Paraprofessionals already in the system are essential personnel.

Costs: The major "cost" has been lost state funding due to reduced identification of handicapped students (estimated at \$120,000); personnel are funded through a combination of state, federal (Chapter One) and local district monies, including a state grant as an experimental project. Less local money is allocated to special education due to the reduction in identification.

Evaluation Plan /Results: Student outcome data are collected via fall and spring achievement testing, staff satisfaction surveys, records of referral and placement into special programs, service delivery data, student behavioral data, and parent attitude surveys. Individual goals and objectives are also developed and monitored for individual students participating under Chapter One, special education or remedial education programs. Specific interventions are evaluated. The University of Washington and Washington State Office of Public Instruction are also collaborating with Olympia schools to evaluate the impact of MERGE on student performance. Data from 1985-86 indicate significant gains in standardized achievement test performance for target students in MERGE schools versus those in comparison schools, with more consistent gains noted in reading than math. Generally, surveys indicated that teachers at project schools regarded support services more positively than did teachers at comparison schools following a year of implementation.

Replication/Consultation: Contact director or contact person noted above for additional information or to arrange site visits.

ARKANSAS

Restructuring for Higher Order Learning
Arkansas Department of Education
4 State Capitol Mall #404A
Little Rock, AR 72201

Contact: Marie Parker (501) 682-4243

Fifteen sites have been selected to restructure schools to improve student learning. Waivers from state rules and regulations may be requested. Plans call for small grants of \$5000 for planning, and grants of \$30,000 per year for implementation. Accountability systems must be included for reporting results.

MAINE

Restructuring Schools Project
Maine Department of Education and Cultural Services
State House Station No. 23
Augusta, ME 04333

Contact: Richard Card, Deputy Commissioner
(207) 289-5112

Seven schools have been granted \$10,000 to plan school reorganizations to more effectively serve all students; three schools have already received three-year implementation grants of \$50,000 per year in this state-funded initiative. Waivers may be requested regarding state rules, and evaluation plans must be included in each project.

MASSACHUSETTS

Carnegie Schools
Massachusetts Department of Education
Commonwealth of Massachusetts
1385 Hancock St.
Quincy, MA 02169

Contact: Barbara Brauner Berns (617) 770-7309

The state of Massachusetts has established a 1.5 million dollar grant program to encourage innovation in school management and decision-making in order to improve student performance. Planning and implementation grants of \$30,000 each have already been awarded to 7 schools. Technical assistance and appropriate waivers of state rules are available.

NEW JERSEY

The Turning Point: The Plan to Revise Special Education
New Jersey State Department of Education
Trenton, NJ

Contact: Saul Cooperman, Commissioner of Education

The State of New Jersey has initiated a comprehensive plan to improve the delivery of services to all children. Prior to statewide implementation, a series of ten districts were chosen to pilot the plan recommended by a committee of professionals, parents, and community members. The major aspects of the plan include the following: 1) School Resource Committees, designed to enhance communication between regular and special education, are proactive problem solving groups providing pre-referral intervention support within the regular classroom. 2) Expanded Child Study Team responsibilities provide services to both regular and special education students, and include counseling and consultation in addition to evaluation activities. 3) Evaluation procedures are more clearly defined to address referral issues and technical adequacy. Specific domains must be evaluated by specified personnel. 4) Uniform standards of eligibility for special education have been established to address the presence of a handicap and the educational impact of the handicap. Functional assessments and parent interviews are included as part of the required evaluations. 5) Resource room models have been transformed into Resource Centers which can provide services within a regular classroom as well as through pull-out programs. More intensive levels of special education services are provided, but based upon instructional need rather than handicap label. 6) Expanded roles for school psychologists include consultation and counseling to students in regular as well as special education.

NORTH CAROLINA

LEAD Teachers Restructuring Project
Public School Reform of North Carolina
117 Glenwood Av
Raleigh, NC 27603

Contact: John Dornan (919) 832-1584

A two-year, \$450,000 pilot program at six schools is intended to improve student learning by developing alternative decision-making structures and creating new roles for teachers. Evaluation will include measures of student performance and employee satisfaction.

WASHINGTON

Schools for the 21st Century
Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction
Old Capitol Building
Mailstop FG-11
Olympia, WA 98504

Contact: Marcia Costello (206) 586-4512

Individual schools and districts have received state funding to restructure schools to improve student learning. Each of the 21 projects has six years of experimentation, with more programs to be funded in the future. Evaluation must include measures of student performance.

Position Statement

Advocacy for Appropriate Educational Services for All Children

P.L. 94-142 (The Education of All Handicapped Children Act) has achieved major goals in serving handicapped children, many of whom had been previously excluded from appropriate educational programs. Since its enactment in 1975, all handicapped children have been guaranteed a free and appropriate education, the right to due process, and individualization of program according to need. We strongly support the continuation of legislation which has mandated these guarantees.

We also recognize that serious problems have been encountered as school districts strive to meet these mandates and that quality education is still an elusive goal. Some of these problems reflect difficulties within special education; others appear to be special education issues but have their origins in the regular education system.

One major set of problems involves reverse sides of the issue of access to appropriate education: (1) On the one hand, access to special education must be assured for all significantly handicapped children who need and can benefit from it. (2) Conversely, children are being inappropriately diagnosed as handicapped and placed in special education because of: (a) a lack of regular education options designed to meet the needs of children with diverse learning styles, (b) a lack of understanding, at times, of diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds, and (c) inadequate measurement technologies which focus on labels for placement rather than providing information for program development.

It is not a benign action to label as "handicapped" children who are low achievers but are not, in fact, handicapped, even when this is done in order to provide them with services unavailable in general education. School personnel often resort to labeling because it seems the only way to obtain needed services for children. This is an unfortunate result of categorical models which attach funding to classifications. Other problems originating in the classification system include:

- Labels that are often irrelevant to instructional needs.
- Categories, based on deficit labels, that are rather arbitrarily defined, particularly for mildly handicapped and low achieving students, but which come to be accepted as "real" and may prevent more meaningful understanding of the child's psychoeducational needs. The intent of this statement is not necessarily to endorse mixing children with different moderate to severe handicaps in a single special education classroom.
- Reduced expectations for children who are placed in special needs programs.
- Assessment processes aimed at determining eligibility which often deflects limited resources from the determination of functional educational needs and the development of effective psychoeducational programs.
- A decreased willingness on the part of regular education, at times bordering on abdication of responsibility to modify curricula and programs in order to better meet the diverse needs of all children.

As increasing numbers of children are classified as handicapped and removed from regular classrooms for special instruction, there has been a dramatic reduction in the range of abilities among children who remain within the general education system. Concurrently, as national standards for excellence are being raised, the number of children at risk for school failure is growing dramatically. Without provisions to prepare students for higher expectations through effective instructional programs, many of these children may also be identified as handicapped and placed in special education. This climate, in which children are tested and labeled as failures or as handicapped in increasing numbers, creates an urgent need for reexamination and change in the system which provides access to services.

In view of these problems, and based upon the commitment to see that all children receive effective and appropriate education irrespective of race, cultural background, linguistic background, socioeconomic status, or educational need, we believe:

- All children can learn. Schools have a responsibility to teach them, and school personnel and parents should work together to assure every child a free and appropriate education in a positive social environment.

- Instructional options, based on the individual psychoeducational needs of each child, must be maximized within the general education system. Necessary support services should be provided within general education, eliminating the need to classify children as handicapped in order to receive these services.

- Psychoeducational needs of children should be determined through a multi-dimensional, non-biased assessment process. This must evaluate the match between the learner and his or her educational environment, assessing the compatibility of curriculum and system as they interact with the child, rather than relying on the deficit based model which places the blame for failure within the child. Referral to the assessment and placement process must always relate directly to services designed to meet psychoeducational needs.

- In addition to maintaining current protection for handicapped children, protections and safeguards must be developed to assure the rights of children who are at risk for school failure and require services while remaining in general education without classification as handicapped.

We propose a new national initiative to meet the educational needs of all children:

We propose the development and piloting of alternatives to the current categorical system. This requires reevaluation of funding mechanisms, and advocacy for policy and funding waivers needed, for the piloting of alternative service delivery models. It also requires the development of increased support systems and extensive retraining of all school personnel to enable them to work effectively with a broad range of children with special needs within the regular education system.

This initiative will encourage greater independence for children by enabling them to function within the broadest possible environment, and independence for school personnel by providing them with training and support so they can help a wide range of children.

The types and extent of change we are suggesting should be made cautiously. Targeted funds intended for children with moderate and severe handicapping conditions must be protected. Similarly, resources for children who are not handicapped, but who experience learning difficulties, must be protected even though these children are served within general education. We need to assure that no child is put at risk for loss of services while the change process is occurring.

Our task is to reduce the rigidities of the current system without taking away the protections offered by P.L. 94-142. All experimentation and research must take place within a framework of maximum protection for children. It is highly likely that this may require the development of temporary parallel systems — the traditional system of classification and placement under P.L. 94-142, and a system of experimental programs, primarily within general education — until satisfactory models can be developed which meet the requirements of accountability, due process, and protection of students' and parents' rights, and provide funding for students in need of services. In addition, while these recommended modifications might reduce the risk of misclassification due to cultural or linguistic differences, we caution that these issues must continue to be monitored and discussed during the transition period and beyond.

Because of the complexity of these issues, the generation of effective solutions will require a national effort of interested persons and organizations which we hope to generate through this task force. We will actively work toward the collaboration of a wide variety of individuals and organizations, joining together to develop a strong base of knowledge, research, and experience in order to establish new frameworks and conceptualizations on which to base decisions, design feasible service delivery options, advocate for policy and funding changes needed to implement these alternatives, and coordinate efforts and share information for positive change. We invite you to join with us.

Position Statement on RIGHTS WITHOUT LABELS

The Rights Without Labels concept has been developed to address problems associated with the classification and labeling of children as "handicapped" for educational purposes. This classification establishes certain legal rights for children and parents, often including funds for schools offering specialized services.

Problems permeate this system: unreliability of classification; lack of instructional relevance for some classifications; exclusion of children from regular education; and the stigmatization of classified children. Moreover, removing these classifications and labels to return a student to regular education has proved very difficult.

The Rights Without Labels guidelines presented here have special significance for children with academic and/or behavioral difficulties who are frequently classified as learning disabled, educable mentally retarded or behavior disordered/emotionally disturbed. Our intention, however, is to apply these guidelines to as broad a range of exceptionalities as is feasible and in no way to diminish opportunities for even the severely/profoundly handicapped student to be served in settings with their non-handicapped peers.

The Rights Without Labels guidelines are based on the assumption that it would be desirable at this time to conduct programs wherein efforts are made to serve children who have special needs without labeling them or removing them from regular education programs. Research indicates that several factors are critical to the success of such experimental programs.

Pre-Referral Screening/Intervention

Attempts must be made at the very outset to ameliorate educational difficulties through the use of pre-referral screening/intervention methods conducted by regular school personnel with the support of resources typically limited to special education (i.e., school psychologists, teachers, social workers, speech therapist, etc.) This benefits all children especially those experiencing educational problems, while helping to identify students with characteristics consonant with legal definitions of handicapped conditions. Such practices will engender an abiding respect for students' rights under the law not to be evaluated in the absence of genuine suspicion of a handicap.

Curriculum Based Assessment

Secondly, identification and evaluation methods must include curriculum based assessment procedures. Research demonstrates these procedures provide reliable measures of student performance and produce relevant information for instructional planning. Most importantly, they fulfill the evaluation protection criteria set out in P.L. 94-142. The primary purpose of these procedures is not to classify or label children, but rather to identify specific curriculum and instructional deficits and strengths in order to provide a framework to develop appropriate educational programs. Individualized Educational Programs (IEP) continue to be required, as well as related services provided in accordance with current legal guidelines.

Special Resources in Regular Settings

The traditional array of special education supplementary aids, services and resources (including teachers/aides) are available to children only outside the regular classroom. Our goal is to broaden the classroom situation within which special education resources can be used and to reverse the practice of moving handicapped students to special education situations outside regular classes and schools. Instead, special education resources can be transferred into the noncategorically identified students' regular classroom setting.

Position Statement on RIGHTS WITHOUT LABELS GUIDELINES

These guidelines are stated positively as principles for programs which professionals, advocates and parents may wish to examine. The checklist format is provided for use in developing experimental programs in local or state systems.

GUIDELINES FOR ASSURING RIGHTS WITHOUT LABELS IN REGULAR/SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

I. ASSURANCES:

Any proposed alternatives non-categorical program or system shall:

A. Ensure that the fundamental rights afforded handicapped students and their parents under P.L. 94-142 are maintained and safeguarded. These include, but are not limited to:

- (1) Standards for fair and unbiased identification and evaluation of children who would qualify as "handicapped" in a categorical system.
- (2) Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) for all students who would otherwise qualify under a categorical system.
- (3) Specialized instruction and related services for students who would otherwise qualify under a categorical system.
- (4) Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) standards in determining educational placements.
- (5) Appointment of surrogate parents when appropriate.
- (6) Non-discriminatory discipline procedures.
- (7) All timeline standards governing the above practices and procedures.
- (8) Parental rights in the identification, evaluation, IEPs and placement of students who would otherwise qualify under a categorical system.
- (9) Due process rights for parents and students who wish to pursue concerns/complaints regarding educational evaluations, programs and placements.
- (10) Local advisory boards to assist (LEAs) in planning for the provision of appropriate educational services.

B. Provide parents of handicapped students with an alternative to selecting a traditional categorical approach to classification.

C. Provide full disclosure of the noncategorical system to parents including an explanation of resources, services and rights that will be afforded students in this system.

II. GENERAL QUALITY OF ALTERNATIVE PROGRAM: Any proposed non-categorical program or system shall:

A. Employ pre-referral screening/intervention measures and utilize evaluation procedures that include curriculum based assessments.

B. Employ methodology known to be associated with effective teaching/learning (for example, provide students with orderly and productive environments, ample learning/teaching time, systematic and objective feedback on performance, well sequenced curricula, etc.).

C. Focus attention on basic skills as priority areas for instruction (for example, language, self-dependence, reasonable social behavior, mathematics, health and safety, etc.).

D. Provide procedures to identify and respond to the individual needs of all students, and in particular, those who may need modifications in their school program.

E. Provide for special education aids, services and resources to be delivered in regular education settings.

III. ASSESSMENT OF OUTCOMES: Any proposed non-categorical program shall:

A. Have an objective methodology for assessing the educational progress of students in major curriculum domains (including academic, social, motivational and attitudinal variables) and for comparing such progress with results in traditional programs.

B. Contain and utilize a cost-benefit analysis to compare costs with traditional programs.

IV. TEACHING STAFF AND FACILITIES: Any proposed non-categorical program shall:

A. Include instruction and services by teacher and staff who are qualified in accordance with current state certification standards.

B. Include a delivery system that provides continuing staff development responsive to the training needs of the teaching staff and administrative personnel who will be implementing the requirements of the non-categorical program.

C. Include appropriate instructional materials and other resources.

D. Include assurances that funding levels and personnel allocations will not be decreased during the experimental period or as a result of successful alternative service delivery.

* To provide these assurances, it is assumed that as part of the experimental procedures, it would be common to conduct a dual classification system, whereby, for example, a student who might be classified as "learning disabled" in a traditional system would actually be so identified. Although the student's record would reflect the traditional classification, the student would be considered in need of "supplemental services" (i.e. regular and special education services) for purposes of his/her participation in the non-categorical program. Only by such a dual system could assurances concerning "rights" be offered and safeguarded. Over the long term, the traditional classification system might be modified if all stakeholders are satisfied about the new procedure.

A Public Policy Statement

At-Risk Students and Excellence in Education: The Need for Educational Restructuring

The Imperative for Change

Significant changes in social and economic contexts have rendered traditional school structures ineffective. Numerous reports calling for educational reform have been published in recent years; and educators, citizens, and policy makers alike now recognize the serious problems inherent in our current educational system. Some reports have recommended higher standards and expectations, greater emphasis on basic skills or technological training, and increased accountability. Others have called for more widespread application of effective schools and teaching research.

More recently, concern has focused on the increased numbers of students in our schools at-risk for academic and personal problems. Educators and the community at large acknowledge the devastating economic and social impact of high student dropout rates, students graduating without functional skills, and students experiencing serious academic and personal problems which prevent them from becoming productive members of society. Schools are facing increasing numbers of students with multiple risk factors -- children from single parent homes, from immigrant families, from poor families, from dysfunctional families -- as well as ethnic minorities who historically have been denied access to the training and employment needed to participate in an increasingly complex society. Social-personal problems confronting students, such as teenage pregnancy, substance abuse, neglect, peer pressures and family stress, contribute to increasingly complex educational needs.

It has become clear that striving for excellence in education without also ensuring equity leaves large numbers of students disenfranchised. NASP is committed to finding the most effective ways to educate all students. The NASP position statement, *Advocacy for Appropriate Education for All Students* (1985), recognized the limitation of categorical approaches in meeting the needs of students with learning problems and called for careful piloting of alternative delivery systems that increase access and reduce barriers to effective instruction for all students. We renew and expand this call for alternatives to the current educational delivery system.

NASP believes that many of our basic assumptions about schooling need to be reconsidered. Given the magnitude of the problems making minor adjustments to the current educational system is no longer a credible solution. While increased academic time is essential simply adding more hours, more standards, and more requirements will not meet the goals of either equity or excellence.

Among the traditional assumptions that need to be questioned are age-graded, lock-step classes, extensive use of retention and tracking, emphasis on norm-referenced comparisons, and categorical eligibility requirements for special assistance that are unrelated to instructional needs. The knowledge to facilitate a thoughtful and effective restructuring of our system of schooling is available and is continuing to grow. Schools must be altered significantly to be relevant to a changing society and a changing population.

Considerations in Restructuring Education

There is no single model for restructuring schools. Decisions about restructuring should be made by partnerships of policy makers, administrators and school personnel working within the goals and purposes of education shared by the community. However, a number of principles and underlying beliefs should be considered in any implementation efforts. Restructured schools should:

- ... Ensure a single educational system for all students that integrates special services and support programs with the regular education program.

- ... Ensure the rights of all students to an appropriate education and involve parents at all levels of decision making. An appropriate education should emphasize student outcomes that include maximized academic achievement, productive work attitudes and skills, and healthy personal and social development.

- ... Involve parents in the education of their children and in schools in meaningful ways.

- ... Support meaningful school-based decision making and local flexibility. However, redesigned schools should be based on the most current psychological knowledge about learning and development, as well as effective instruction. Local decision making without an empirical base may lead to less than optimal results and even move in harmful directions.

- ... Ensure a challenging curriculum for all students that can be adapted individually as appropriate. High expectations should be held for all students. Instructional effectiveness should be the hallmark feature.

- ... Promote heterogeneous age-grade groupings and competency standards, such that all students of a given age are not expected to master the same objectives in the same period of time. Seek alternatives to the use of retention as an academic intervention.

- ... Recognize that children learn in different ways and incorporate experiential and participative learning strategies into instruction that promotes understanding and problem-solving. Emphasize heterogeneous classes, cooperative learning, peer-assisted learning, and other adaptive education strategies that meet individual learning needs in diverse group settings.

- ... Ensure a caring, personalized school environment that supports the social/emotional needs, as well as the academic needs, of students. This environment should be reflected in design of programs, curriculum and attitudes of all staff. High quality youth-adult relationships should be evident.

- ... Encourage prevention and early intervention, including developmental early childhood programs for socio-economically disadvantaged children and other at-risk children.

*** Emphasize assessment that focuses on the instructional and functional needs of the student, including progress in the curriculum, rather than assignment to categories or groups. Normative group assessment should be minimized in making decisions for and about students. Outcome measures should directly reflect success of specific school and student efforts and provide for direct and frequent monitoring of student progress.

*** Maintain or expand existing levels of federal, state, and local funding, which provide instructional and support services in a manner that ensures their availability for all students.

*** Encourage active private/public cooperation, but not at the expense of adequate government funding of educational programs and services.

*** Recognize that schools cannot accomplish their goals alone. Community supports to youth must be expanded; coordination among schools and community services to meet the health, welfare, and social needs of children and their families must be ensured. Increased attention to school-work transitions for many students is essential.

*** Find creative and new ways to recognize and reward excellence among teachers and students.

Next Steps

NASP joins other groups in recognizing the need to reexamine existing educational assumptions and systems. We believe the knowledge and research base is available to educate effectively all students in the mainstream of education. It is only through the united efforts of the many public and private stakeholders in the education of our youth that meaningful restructuring can occur. As we work collaboratively to explore viable options and alternatives, several dimensions that will influence the change process must be considered.

*** Funding mechanisms must be examined for their impact on the access to and utilization of programs and services. If necessary, pilot efforts should be granted waivers from funding source regulations that restrict innovation on the basis of accountability for outcomes. Dual systems of record keeping and operation may be necessary until success of new models and paradigms can be demonstrated. In all cases, due process rights of students and parents must be protected.

*** Policies at the local, state, and federal levels must be examined for the extent to which they constrain or facilitate effective instructional and schooling processes. Again, waivers for pilot efforts based on outcomes may be necessary.

*** Attitudes of educators, parents, students, and the community are a significant factor in the speed and ease of organizational change. They must be considered and addressed, so that they better support the restructuring process. Effective systems change requires efforts to empower those who are involved in it. All participants involved must feel some ownership for new programs and procedures and be part of the planning to restructure systems.

*** Effective preservice and inservice training for all public school personnel is critical. New systems will require new skills. University training programs in all areas must be consistent with the most current knowledge base in order to prepare personnel with essential skills and attitudes for restructured schools. Substantive and ongoing inservice training must be provided for existing personnel to address skills required in restructured schools. The nature and delivery of preservice and inservice training may need to be redesigned.

NASP is eager to participate in discussion, planning, implementation and evaluation of pilot restructuring efforts with schools, other organizations, and policy makers.

The Role of School Psychology in Educational Restructuring

For restructuring to occur, all education professions must work collaboratively in planning, implementing, and evaluating shared goals and outcomes. Each profession has important skills to bring to the process. NASP identifies here the knowledge and skills that school psychologists can contribute to educational restructuring.

The knowledge base for the practice of school psychology provides an important empirical foundation for educational practice. Professional school psychologists are trained in human behavior, including learning, social and emotional development. As data-oriented problem solvers, they are trained to approach problems from a systemic perspective and to consider the many interacting factors that influence educational attainment. As children's lives become more complex and as family, school and other social structures change, this systemic view assumes greater importance. Working collaboratively with other educators, policy makers, parents, and students, school psychologists can make an important contribution to school effectiveness.

As an integral part of educational restructuring, school psychologists can:

*** facilitate the process of planning for restructuring by applying expertise in organizational consultation, group process, problem solving, and planning;

*** integrate their services fully into the "general" education system;

*** provide consultation and planning for effective classroom organization and social structures, as well as implementation of effective teaching principles;

*** assist in modifying instructional practices to make them more appropriate to the social and academic needs of students with diverse backgrounds and characteristics;

*** develop functional assessment procedures that measure instructional progress and learning outcomes;

*** participate in developing curricula which promote mentally healthy children and adolescents, including topics of substance abuse prevention, sexuality, child care, relationship building, personal problem solving, suicide prevention and others;

*** establish procedures for early identification of an intervention for learning, social and emotional difficulties;

*** help develop meaningful, collaborative partnerships between school and home and provide interventions, including parent education, to families where needed;

*** develop collaborative relationships with relevant community agencies, including medical, social, economic, and family support systems; and

*** apply their training in psychology and research to studying practical problems of instructional and organizational effectiveness and to evaluating the outcomes of educational innovations.

Implementing New Roles

School psychological services should be examined in terms of their impact on students. Although extremely difficult to address, outcome measures also must be applied to psychological services and programs. In applying their own skills, school psychologists must seek to utilize the knowledge and skills of other education professionals in pursuing the challenge of restructuring schools to enhance the academic and personal success of all students. In addition, schools should strive to create the opportunities for school psychologists to perform these roles by implementing policies and funding strategies that promote services to all students.

Bibliography

I. Alternative Classroom Interventions (Chapters 1-4)

- Algozzine, B., & Maheady, L. (Eds.) (1986). In search of excellence: Instruction that works in special education classrooms. [Special issue]. Exceptional Children, 52 (6).
- Aronson, E. (1968). The Jigsaw Classroom. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Bangert, R. L., Kulik, J. A., & Kulik, C. A. (1983). Individualized systems of instruction in secondary schools. Review of Educational Research, 59, 149-158.
- Becker, W. C., & Carnine, D. W. (1981). Direct instruction: A behavior theory model for comprehensive educational intervention with the disadvantaged. In S. W. Bijou & R. Ruiz (Eds.), Behavior modification: Contributions to education. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Bereiter, C., & Bird, M. (1985). Use of thinking aloud in identification and teaching of reading comprehension strategies. Cognition and Instruction, 2, 131-156.
- Biklen, D. (1985). Achieving the complete school: Strategies for effective mainstreaming. New York: Columbia University Teachers College Press.
- Boehnlein, M. (1987). Reading interventions for high-risk first graders. Educational Leadership, 44(3), 31-37.
- Bohlmeier, E., & Burke, J. P. (1986). Selecting cooperative learning techniques: A consultative strategy guide. School Psychology Review, 16, 36-49.
- Botvin, G. (1983). Life skills training: Teacher's manual. New York: Smithfield Press.
- Bright, J. T. (1987). Adaptive Learning Environments Model: The Randolph County West Virginia Follow Through Demonstration Training Project. Randolph County, WV: Randolph County School District.
- Brookover, W. B., Beamer, L., Efthim, J., Hathaway, D., Lezotte, L., Miller, S., Passalacqua, J., & Tornatzky, L. (1982). Creating effective schools: An inservice program for enhancing school learning climate and achievement. Holmes Beach, FL: Learning Publications, Inc.
- Brophy, J. E., & Good, T. L. (1986). Teacher behavior and student achievement. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (pp. 328-375). New York: Macmillan.
- Camp, M., & Bash, B. (1981). Think aloud: Improving social and cognitive skills. Champaign, IL: Research Press.

- Campbell, P. (1987). The integrated programming team: An approach for coordinating professionals of various disciplines in programs for students with severe and multiple handicaps. Journal of the Association for Persons With Severe Handicaps, 12, 107-116.
- Cicchelli, T., & Ashby-Davis, C. (1986). Teaching exceptional children and youth in the regular classroom. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Conway, R., & Gow, L. (1988). Mainstreaming special class students with mild handicaps through group instruction. Remedial and Special Education, 9, 34-40.
- Cummings, J. A., & Nelson, R. B. (1982). The alternative educational plan. School Psychology Review, 11, 336-337.
- Darch, D., Carnine, D., & Gersten, R. (1984). Explicit instruction in mathematics problem solving. Journal of Educational Research, 77(66), 350-359.
- Dawson, M. (1987). Beyond ability grouping: A review of the effectiveness of ability grouping and its alternatives. School Psychology Review, 16, 348-369.
- Deshler, D. D., Alley, G. R., Warner, M. M., & Schumaker, J. B. (1981). Instructional practices for promoting skill acquisition and generalization in severely learning disabled adolescents. Learning Disabilities Quarterly, 4(4), 415-421.
- Deshler, D. D., & Schumaker, J. B. (1986). Learning strategies: An instructional alternative for low-achieving adolescents. Exceptional Children, 52(6), 583-590.
- D'Zambo, M. & Raiser, L. (1986). A strategy for individualizing directed group instruction. Teaching Exceptional Children, 18, 190-196.
- Ehly, S. (1986). Peer tutoring: a guide for school psychologists. Washington, DC: National Association of School Psychologists.
- Ehly, S., & Larson, S. C. (1980). Peer tutoring for individual instruction. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Elliott, S., Gresham, F., & Heffer, R. (1987). Social skills interventions: Research findings and training techniques. In C. Maher & J. Zins (Eds.), Psychoeducational interventions in schools: Methods and procedures for enhancing student competence (pp.141-159). New York: Pergamon.
- Ellis, E. S., Lenz, B. K., & Sabornie, E. J. (1987). Generalization and adaptation of learning strategies to natural environments: Part I: Critical agents. Remedial and Special Education, 8(1), 6-20.
- Feuerstein, R. (1980). Instructional enrichments: An intervention program for cognitive modifiability. Baltimore, MD: University Park Press.
- Fowler, S. A. (1986). Peer-monitoring and self-monitoring: Alternatives to traditional teacher management. Exceptional Children, 52, 573-581.
- Fuchs, D., & Fuchs, L. (1988). Evaluation of the Adaptive Learning Environments Model. Exceptional Children, 54, 115-127.

Gerber, M., & Kauffman, J. M. (1981). Peer tutoring in academic settings. In P. S. Strain (Ed.), The utilization of classroom peers as behavior change agents. New York: Plenum Press.

Gersten, R., White, W., Felco, R., & Carmine, D. (in press). Enhancing attention of handicapped and non-handicapped students through a dynamic presentation of instructional stimuli. Analysis and Intervention in Developmental Disabilities.

Gettinger, M. (1988). Methods of proactive classroom management. School Psychology Review, 17, 227-242.

Goldstein, A. P., Sprafkin, R. P., Gershaw, N. J., & Klein, P. (1986). Skillstreaming the adolescent: A structured learning approach to teaching prosocial skills. Champaign, IL: Research Press.

Greenwood, C. R., Carta, J., & Hall, R. V. (1988). The use of peer tutoring strategies in classroom management and educational instruction. School Psychology Review, 17, 258-275.

Hazel, J. S., Schumaker, J. B., Sherman, J. A., & Sheldon-Wildgren, J. (1981). ASSET: A social skills program for adolescents. Champaign, IL: Research Press.

Idol, L., West, F. J., & Lloyd, S. R. (1988). Organizing and implementing specialized reading programs: A collaborative approach involving classroom, remedial, and special education teachers. Remedial and Special Education, 9, 54-61.

Jeter, J. (Ed.). (1980). Approaches to individualized education. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Jenkins, J. R., & Jenkins, L. M. (1987). Making peer tutoring work. Educational Leadership, 44(3), 64-68.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. (1986). Impact of classroom organization and instructional methods on the effectiveness of mainstreaming. In C. J. Meisel (Ed.), Mainstreaming handicapped children (pp. 219-250). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1986). Mainstreaming and cooperative learning strategies. Exceptional Children, 52, 553-561.

Johnson, R., & Johnson, D. (1981). Building friendships between handicapped and nonhandicapped students: Effects of cooperative and individualistic instruction. American Educational Research Journal, 18, 415-424.

Jones, V., & Jones, L. (1986). Comprehensive classroom management. Newton, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Keyayan, V. A. (1986). Peer outreach service team (POST): A multi-service program. Peer Facilitator Quarterly, 4(2), 4-5.

Ladd, G. W., & Asher, S. R. (1985). Social skill training and children's peer relations. In L. L'Abate & M. A. Milan (Eds.), Handbook of social skills training and research (pp. 219-244). New York: Wiley.

Larrivee, B. (1985). Effective teaching for successful mainstreaming. New York: Longman.

LeBlanc, J. M., Etzel, B. C., & Domash, M. A. (1978). A functional curriculum for early intervention. In K. E. Allen, V. A. Holm, & R. L. Schiefelbusch (Eds.), Early intervention: A team approach. Baltimore: University Park Press.

Lentz, F. E., & Shapiro, E. S. (1986). Functional assessment of the academic environment. School Psychology Review, 15, 346-357.

Lerner, J., Dawson, D., & Horvath, L. (1980). Cases in learning and behavior problems: A guide to individualized education programs. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Levin, H. M. (1987). Accelerated schools for disadvantaged students. Educational Leadership, 44(3), 19-21.

Lewis, R. B., & Doorlag, D. H. (1983). Teaching special students in the mainstream. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company.

Mace, F. C., Browder, D., & Martin, D. (1988). Reduction of stereotypy via instruction of alternative leisure behavior. School Psychology Review, 17, 156-165.

Mace, F., Brown, D., & West, B. (1987). Behavioral self-management in education. In C. Maher & J. Zins (Eds.), Psychoeducational interventions in the schools: Methods and procedures for enhancing student competence (pp.110-176). Elmsford, NY: Pergamon Press.

Madden, N. A., & Slavin, R. E. (1983). Effects of cooperative learning on the social acceptance of mainstreamed academically handicapped students. Journal of Special Education, 17, 171-182.

Maheady, L., Sacca, M. K., & Harper, G. F. (1987). Classwide student tutoring teams: The effects of peer-mediated instruction on the academic performance of secondary mainstreamed students. Journal of Special Education, 21, 107-121.

Maher, C. A., & Forman, S. G. (Eds.). (1987). A behavioral approach to education of children and youth. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Marston, D., & Magnusson, D. (1988). Curriculum-based measurement: District level implementation. In J. L. Graden, J. E. Zins, & M. J. Curtis (Eds.), Alternative educational delivery systems: Enhancing instructional options for all students (pp.137-172). Washington, DC: National Association of School Psychologists.

McGinnes, E., Goldstein, A. P., Sprafkin, R. P., & Gershaw, N. J. (1984). Skill-streaming the elementary school child: A guide for teaching prosocial skills. Champaign, IL: Research Press.

Meichenbaum, D. (1986). Metacognitive methods of instruction: Current status and future prospects. In M. Schwebel & C. A. Maher (Eds.), Facilitating cognitive development: International perspectives, programs, and practices (pp. 23-32). New York: Haworth.

- Meyers, J., & Kundert, D. (1988). Implementing process assessment. In J. L. Graden, J. E. Zins, & M. J. Curtis (Eds.), Alternative educational delivery systems: Enhancing instructional options for all students (pp.173-198). Washington, DC: National Association of School Psychologists.
- Meyers, J., Lytle, S. (1986). Assessing the process of learning. Exceptional Children, 53, 138-144.
- Michelson, F., Sugai, D., Wood, R., & Kazdin, A. (1983). Social skills assessment and training with children. New York: Plenum.
- Miller, J. A., & Peterson, D. W. (1987). Peer influenced academic interventions. In C. A. Maher & J. E. Zins (Eds.), Psychoeducational interventions in the schools (pp.81-100). New York: Pergamon.
- Molnar, A., & Lindquist, B. (1989). Changing problem behavior in schools. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Paine, S., & others. (1983). Structuring your classroom for academic success. Champaign, IL: Research Press.
- Peterson, J. (1985). Adaptive learning environments model: A comprehensive mainstreaming model. Minnesota Elementary School Principal, Winter, 30-32.
- Peterson, J., Heisted, D., Peterson, D., & Reynolds, M. (1985). Montevideo individualized prescriptive instructional management system. Exceptional Children, 52(3), 239-243.
- Rosenkoetter, S. E., & Fowler, S. A. (1986). Teaching children to manage daily activity changes in the classroom. Teaching Exceptional Children, 19, 20-23.
- Shapiro, E. S. (1987). Behavioral assessment in school psychology. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Shapiro, E. S. (1988). Preventing academic failure. School Psychology Review, 17(4), 601-613.
- Shapiro, E. S. (1989). Academic skills assessment. New York: Guilford.
- Shinn, M. (Ed.). (1989). Curriculum-based measurement. New York: Guilford.
- Shinn, M. (1988). Development of curriculum-based local norms for use in special education decision-making. School Psychology Review, 17, 61-80.
- Slavin, R. E. (1983). Cooperative learning. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Slavin, R. E., Stevens, R. J., & Madden, N. A. (1988). Accomodating student diversity in reading and writing instruction: A cooperative learning approach. Remedial and Special Education, 9, 60-66.
- Slavin, R., Leavey, M., & Madden, N. (1984). Combining cooperative learning and individualized instruction. Elementary School Journal, 84, 410-422.
- Slavin, R., Madden, N., Leavey, M. (1984). Effects of cooperative learning and individualized instruction on mainstreamed students. Exceptional Children, 50, 434-443.

Smith, G., & Smith, D. (1989). Schoolwide study skills program: The key to mainstreaming. Teaching Exceptional Children, 21, 20-23.

Tindal, G. (1988). Curriculum-based assessment. In J. L. Graden, J. E. Zins, & M. J. Curtis (Eds.), Alternative educational delivery systems: Enhancing instructional options for all students (pp.111-136. Washington, DC: National Association of School Psychologists.

Tindal, G. (1989). Evaluating the effectiveness of educational programs at the systems level using CBM. In M. Shinn (Ed.), Applications of curriculum-based measurement to the development of programs for mildly handicapped students. New York: Guilford.

Wang, M. (1980). Adaptive instruction: Building on diversity. Theory into Practice, 19, 122-128.

Wang, M. C. (1981). Mainstreaming exceptional children: Some instructional design considerations. Elementary School Journal, 81(4), 195-221.

Wang, M. C., & Baker, E. T. (1985-86). Mainstreaming programs: Design features and effects. The Journal of Special Education, 19(4), 503-521.

Wang, M. C., & Birch, J. W. (1984). Comparison of a full-time mainstreaming program and a resource room approach. Exceptional Children, 51, 33-40.

Wang, M. C., & Birch, J. W. (1984). Effective special education in regular classes. Exceptional Children, 50, 371-398.

Wang, M. C., Reynolds, M. C., & Schwartz, L. L. (1988). Adaptive instruction: An alternative educational approach for students with special needs. In J. L. Graden, J. E. Zins, & M. J. Curtis (Eds.), Alternative educational delivery systems: Enhancing instructional options for all students (pp.199-220). Washington, DC: National Association of School Psychologists.

Wang, M. & Walberg, H. (Eds.). (1985). Adapting instruction to individual differences. Berkeley, CA: McCutcheon.

Weinstein, C.E. & Mayer, R.E. (1986). The teaching of learning strategies. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (3rd edition). New York: MacMillan.

Winter, D. (1987). Adaptive Learning Environments Model: The Waterloo Community Schools, Iowa Follow Through Demonstration Training Project. Waterloo, IA: Waterloo School District.

Wise, P., Genshaft, J., & Byrley, M. (1987), Study skills training: A comprehensive approach. In C. Maher & J. Zins (Eds.), Psychoeducational interventions in the schools: Methods and procedures for enhancing student competence (pp.66-80). Elmsford, NY: Pergamon.

Ysseldyke, J. E., & Christenson, S. L. (1988). Linking assessment to intervention. In J. L. Graden, J. E. Zins, & M. J. Curtis (Eds.), Alternative educational delivery systems: Enhancing instructional options for all students (pp. 91-110). Washington, DC: National Association of School Psychologists.

Zins, J. E., Maher, C.A., Murphy, J. J., & Wess, B.P. (1988). The peer support group: A means to facilitate professional development. School Psychology Review, 17, 138-146.

Zins, J. R., Curtis, M. J., Graden, J. L., & Ponti, C. R. (1988). Helping students succeed in the regular classroom. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

II. Alternative Referral/Consultation Models (Chapter 5)

Algozzine, B., Christenson, S., & Ysseldyke, J. S. (1982). Probabilities associated with the referral to placement process. Teacher Education and Special Education, 5, 19-23.

Alpert, J. L. (1982). Psychological consultation in educational settings. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bergan, J. R. (1977). Behavioral consultation. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.

Brown, D., Pryzwansky, W. B., & Schulte, A. C. (1987). Psychological consultation to theory and practice. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Carter, J., & Sugai, G. (1988). Survey on prereferral practices: Responses from state department of education. Exceptional Children, 54, 298-302.

Chalfant, J. C., Pysh, M. V., & Moultrie, R. (1979). Teacher assistance teams: A model for within building problem solving. Learning Disabilities Quarterly, 2, 85-96.

Conoley, J. C., & Conoley, C. W. (1982). School consultation: Guide to practice and training. New York: Pergamon.

Curtis, M. J., & Anderson, T. E. (1976). Consulting in educational settings: A collaborative approach (slide/tape). Cincinnati, OH: Faculty Resource Center, University of Cincinnati.

Curtis, M. J., & Meyers, J. (1985). Best practices in school-based consultation. In A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds.), Best practices in school psychology (pp.79-94). Washington, DC: National Association of School Psychologists.

Curtis, M. J., Zins, J. E., & Graden, J. L. (1987). Prereferral intervention programs: Enhancing student performance in regular education settings. In C. A. Maher & J. E. Zins (Eds.), Psychoeducational interventions in the schools (pp.7-25). Elmsford, NY: Pergamon.

Friend, M. (1984). Consultation skills for resource teachers. Learning Disability Quarterly, 7, 246-250.

Fuchs, D., & Fuchs, L. S. (1988). Mainstream assistance teams to accommodate difficult-to-teach students in general education. In J. L. Graden, J. E. Zins, & M. J. Curtis (Eds.), Alternative educational delivery systems: Enhancing instructional options for all students (pp.49-70). Washington, DC: National Association of School Psychologists.

- Gallessich, J. (1982). The profession and practice of consultation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Goodstein, L. D. (1978). Consulting in human service organizations. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Graden, J. L., Casey, A., & Bonstrom, O. (1985). Implementing a prereferral intervention system: Part II. The data. Exceptional Children, 51, 487-496.
- Graden, J. L., Casey, A., & Christenson, S. L. (1985). Implementing a prereferral intervention system: Part I. The model. Exceptional Children, 51, 377-384.
- Graebner, J., & Dobbs, S. (1984). A team approach to problem solving in the classroom. Phi Delta Kappan, 66, 138-141.
- Gresham, F. M. (1982). Handbook for behavioral consultation. Des Moines, IA: Department of Public Instruction.
- Gutkin, T. B., & Curtis, M. J. (in press). School-based consultation: Theory, research, and techniques. In T. B. Gutkin & C. R. Reynolds (Eds.), The handbook of school psychology (2nd edition). New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Gutkin, T. B., Henning-Stout, M. & Piersel, W. C. (1988). Impact of a district-wide behavioral consultation prereferral intervention service on patterns of school psychological service delivery. Professional School Psychology, 3, 301-308.
- Gutkin, T. B., & Hickman, J. (1988). Teachers' perceptions of control over presenting problems and resulting preferences for consultation versus referral services. Journal of School Psychology, 26, 395-398.
- Huefner, D. (1988). The consulting teacher model: Risks and opportunities. Exceptional Children, 54, 403-414.
- Idol, L., Paolucci-Whitcomb, P., & Levin, A. (1984). Collaborative consultation. Rockville, MD: Aspen Publications.
- Inman, L., & Tollefson, N. (1988). Elementary teachers' attitudes toward preassessment procedures. Psychology in the Schools, 25, 331-337.
- Lennox, N., Hyman, I. A., & Hughes, C. (1988). Institutionalization of a consultation-based service delivery system. In J. L. Graden, J. E. Zins, & M. J. Curtis (Eds.), Alternative educational delivery systems: Enhancing instructional options for all students (pp.71-90). Washington, DC: National Association of School Psychologists.
- Maher, C. A. (in press). Providing prereferral support services to regular classroom teachers: The teacher resource team. Education and Treatment of Children.
- Marston, D., Mirkin, P. K., & Deno, S. L. (1984). Curriculum-based measurement of academic skills: An alternative to traditional screening, referral, and identification. Journal of Special Education, 18, 109-117.

Martens, B. K., & Witt, J. C. (1988). Expanding the scope of behavioral consultation: A systems approach to classroom behavior change. Professional School Psychology, 3, 271-282.

McDougall, L., Reschly, D., & Corkery, J. (1988). Changes in referral interviews with teachers after behavioral consultation training. Journal of School Psychology, 26, 225-232.

McGlothlin, J. E. (1981). The school consultation committee: An approach to implementing a teacher consultation model. Behavioral Disorders, 6, 101-107.

Meyers, J., Parsons, R. D., & Martin, R. (1979). Mental health consultation in the schools. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ohio Department of Education (1985). Intervention assistance teams. Columbus, OH: Ohio Department of Education.

Parsons, R. D., & Meyers, J. (1984). Developing consultation skills: A guide to training, development and assessment for human services professionals. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ponti, C. R., Zins, J. E., & Graden, J. L. (1988). Implementing a consultation-based service delivery system to decrease referrals for special education: A case study of organizational considerations. School Psychology Review, 17, 89-100.

Pryzwansky, W. B. (1989). School consultation: Some considerations from a cognitive psychology perspective. Professional School Psychology, 4, 1-14.

Raffaniello, E. M. (1981). Competent consultation: The collaborative approach. In M. J. Curtis & J. E. Zins (Eds.), The Theory and practice of school consultation. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Rosenfield, S. (1987). Instructional consultation. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Schein, E. H. (1969). Processing consultation: Its role in organizational development. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Tindal, G., Shinn, M. Walz, L. & Germann, G. (1987). Mainstream consultation in secondary settings: The Pine County Model. Journal of Special Education, 21, 94-106.

West, F. J., & Cannon, G. S. (1988). Essential collaborative consultation competencies for regular and special educators. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 21, 56-63.

Zins, J. E., & Curtis, M. J. (1984). Building consultation into the educational services delivery system. In C. A. Maher, R. J. Illback, & J. E. Zins (Eds.), Organizational psychology in the schools: A handbook for professionals. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Zins, J. E., Graden, J. L., & Ponti, C. R. (1988). Prereferral interventions to improve special services delivery. Special services in the schools, 4(3/4), 109-130.

Zins, J. E., Ponti, C. R. (1987). Prereferral consultation: A system to decrease special education referral and placement. The Community Psychologist, 20, 10-12.

III. Alternative Mental Health/Support Services (Chapter 6)

Braden, J. P., & Sherrard, P. (1987). Referring families to nonschool agencies: A family systems approach. School Psychology Review, 16, 513-518.

Carlson, C. I. (1987). Resolving school problems with structural family therapy. School Psychology Review, 16, 457-468.

Comer, J. (1985). The Yale-New Haven primary prevention project: A follow-up study. Journal of the American Academy of Child Psychiatry, 24, 154-160.

Conoley, J. C. (1989). Cognitive behavioral approaches and prevention in the schools. In J. N. Hughes & R. Hall (Eds.), Handbook of cognitive-behavioral therapy in the classroom. New York: Pergamon.

Conyne, R. K., Zins, J. E., & Vedder-Dubocq, S. (1988). Primary prevention in the schools: Methods for enhancing student competence. In J. L. Graden, J. E. Zins, & M. J. Curtis (Eds.), Alternative educational delivery systems: Enhancing instructional options for all students (pp.221-240). Washington, DC: National Association of School Psychologists.

Davis, J. M., Sandoval, J., & Wilson, M. (1988). Strategies for primary prevention of adolescent suicide. School Psychology Review, 17(4), 559-569.

Dombalis, A., & Erchul, W. P. (1987). Multiple family group therapy: A review of its applicability to the practice of school psychology. School Psychology Review, 16, 487-497.

Elias, M. J., & others. (1982). The improving social awareness-social problem solving project. (Action Research Workshop Report No. 4). New York: W. T. Grant Foundation.

Elias, M. J., & Branden, L. R. (1988). Primary prevention of behavioral and emotional problems in school-aged populations. School Psychology Review, 17(4), 581-592.

Elias, M.J., Gara, M., & Ubriaco, M. (1985). Sources of stress and support in children's transition to middle school: An empirical analysis. Journal of Clinical and Consulting Child Psychology, 14, 112-118.

Elkin, J., Weissberg, R. P., & Cowen, E. L. (1988). Evaluation of a planned short-term intervention for school children with focal adjustment problems. Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 17, 106-115.

Forman, S. G. (Ed.). (1987). School-based affective and social interventions. New York: Haworth.

- Forman, S. G., & Linney, J. (1988). School-based prevention of adolescent substance abuse: Programs, implementation, and future directions. School Psychology Review, 17(4), 550-558.
- Gesten, E. L., & Weissberg, R. P. (1986). Social problem-solving training with children: A guide to effective practice. Special Services in the Schools, 2, 19-40.
- Gesten, E., Weissberg, R., Smith, J., & Amish, P. (1987). Social problem solving training: A skills based approach to prevention and treatment. In C. Maher, & J. Zins (Eds.), Psychoeducational interventions in schools: Methods and procedures for enhancing student competence (pp.26-45). Elmsford, NY: Pergamon Press.
- Gresham, F. M., & Evans, S. (1987). Conceptualization and treatment of social withdrawal in schools. Special Services in the Schools, 3, 37-52.
- Hobbs, N. (1979). The future of children. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kendall, P., & Braswell, L. (1985). Cognitive-behavioral therapy for impulsive children. New York: Guilford Press.
- Lorian, R. P. & Work, W.C. (1987). Affective and social skills development: Preventive strategies for a holistic approach to education. Special Services in the Schools, 3, 155-168.
- Mace, F.C., Yankanich, M.A., & West, B. (1988). Toward a methodology of experimental analysis and treatment of aberrant classroom behaviors. Special Services in the Schools, 4, 71-88.
- Meichenbaum, D. (1986a). Cognitive behavior modification. In F. Kanfer, & A. Goldstein (Eds.), Helping people change: A textbook of methods (pp. 346-380). New York: Pergamon Press.
- Meyers, A. W., & Cohen, R. (1984). Cognitive-behavioral interventions in educational settings. In P. C. Kendall (Ed.), Advances in cognitive-behavioral research and therapy (Vol. 3, pp. 131-167). New York: Academic Press.
- Paavola, J., Hannah, F., & Nichol, G. (1989). The Memphis City Schools Mental Health Center: A program description. Professional School Psychology, 4, 61-74.
- Paget, K. (1988). Adolescent pregnancy: Implications for prevention strategies in education settings. School Psychology Review, 17(4), 570-580.
- Paget, K. D. (1987). Systemic family assessment: Concepts and strategies for school psychologists. School Psychology Review, 16, 429-442.
- Peterson, L. (1988). Preventing the leading killer of children: The role of the school psychologist in injury prevention. School Psychology Review, 17(4), 593-600.
- Roberts, M., & Peterson, L. (Eds.). (1984). Prevention of problems in childhood. New York: Wiley.

Sandoval, J. (Ed.). (1988). Crisis counseling, intervention, and prevention in the schools. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Shapiro, E. S., & Derr, T. (1987). School interventions for aggression. Special Services in the Schools, 3, 5-20.

Spivak, G., Platt, J. J., & Shure, M. D. (1976). The problem-solving approach to adjustment. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Suter, D. P., & Kehle, T. J. (1988). Evaluation of the primary mental health project model of early identification and prevention of school adjustment problems. Special Services in the Schools, 4(3/4), 88-98.

Tharinger, D. J., Krivacska, J. J., Laye-McDonough, M., Jamison, L., Vincent, G. G., & Hedlund, A. D. (1988). Prevention of child sexual abuse: An analysis of issues, educational programs, and research findings. School Psychology Review, 17(4), 614-634.

Walker, H. M., Reavis, H. K., Rhode, G., & Jenson, W. (1988). A conceptual model for delivery of behavioral services to behavior disordered children in a continuum of educational settings. In I. P. Bornstein & A. Kazdin (Eds.), Handbook of clinical behavioral services with children. Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press.

Weissberg, R. P., Gesten, E. L., Leibenstein, N. L., Docherty-Schmid, K., & Hutton, H. (1980). The Rochester social problem-solving (SPS) program: A training manual for teachers of 2nd - 4th grade children. Rochester, NY: University of Rochester.

Zins, J.E., Conyne, R.K., & Ponti, C.R. (1988). Primary prevention: Expanding the impact of psychological services in schools. School Psychology Review, 17, 542-549.

Zins, J.E. & Foreman, S.G. (Eds.). (1988). Primary prevention: From theory to practice [Special issue]. School Psychology Review, 17 (4).

Zins, J. E., & Ponti, C. R. (1985). Strategies for enhancing child and adolescent mental health. In J. E. Zins, D. I. Wagner, & C. A. Maher (Eds.), Health promotion in the schools: Innovative approaches to facilitating physical and emotional well-being (pp. 49-60). New York: Haworth Press.

IV. Alternative Early Intervention Programs (Chapter 7)

Anastasiow, N. J. (1978). Strategies and models for early childhood intervention programs in integrated settings. In M. J. Guralnick (Ed.), Early intervention and the integration of handicapped and non-handicapped children. Baltimore: University Park Press.

Bagnato, S. J., & Neisworth, J. T. (1981). Linking developmental assessment and curricula: Prescriptions for early intervention. Rockville, MD: Aspen Systems.

- Barnett, D. W. (1984). An organizational approach to preschool services: Psychological screening, assessment, and intervention. In C. A. Maher, R. J. Illback, & J. E. Zins (Eds.), Organizational psychology in the schools: A handbook for professionals (pp. 55-82). Springfield, IL: Thomas.
- Billings, D. C., & Wasik, B. H. (1985). Self-instructional training with preschoolers: An attempt to replicate. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 18, 61-67.
- Bryant, D. M., Ramey, C. T., Sparling, J. J., & Wasik, B. H. (1987). The Carolina approach to responsive education: A model for day care. Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 7, 48-60.
- Guralnick, M. J., & Bennett, F. C. (Eds.). (1987). The effectiveness of early intervention for at-risk and handicapped children. New York: Academic Press.
- Hamblin, J. A., & Hamblin, R. L. (1972). On teaching disadvantaged preschoolers to read: A successful experiment. American Educational Research Journal, 9, 209-216.
- Haywood, J. C., Brooks, P., & Burns, S. (1986). Stimulating cognitive development at developmental level: A tested, non-remedial preschool curriculum for preschoolers and older retarded children. In M. Schwebel, & C. A. Maher (Eds.), Facilitating cognitive development: International perspectives, programs, and practices. New York: Haworth.
- Klein, N., & Sheehan, R. (1987). Staff development: A key issue in meeting the needs of young handicapped children in day care settings. Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 7, 13-27.
- Knoblock, P. & Lehr, R. (1986). A model for mainstreaming autistic children: The Jowonio school program. In E. Schopler & G.B. Mesibov (Eds.), Social behavior in autism. New York: Plenum.
- Paget, K. D. (1987). Early behavioral interventions: Grasping the complexities. In J. C. Witt, S. N. Elliott, & F. M. Gresham (Eds.), Handbook of behavior therapy in education. New York: Guilford.
- Paget, K. D. (1985). Preschool services in the schools: Issues and implications. Special Services in the Schools, 2, 71-84.
- Ramey, C. T., & Campbell, F. A. (1984). Preventative education for high-risk children: Cognitive consequences of the Carolina Abecedarian project. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 88, 515-523.
- Rule, S., Killogren, J., Stowitschek, J., Innocenti, M., Striefel, S., & Boswell, C. (1985). Training and support for mainstream day care staff. Early Child Development and Care, 20, 99-113.
- Rule, S., Stowitschek, J., Innocenti, M., Stiefel, S., Killoren, J., & Swezey, K. (in press). The Social Integration Program: An analysis of the effects of mainstreaming handicapped children into day care centers. Education and Treatment of Children.
- Shure, M. B., & Spivack, G. (1978). Problem-solving techniques in childrearing. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Stokes, T. F., & Baer, D. M. (1976). Preschool peers as mutual generalization-facilitating agents. Behavior Therapy, 7, 549-556.

Zeitlin, S. (1981). Learning through coping: An effective preschool program. Journal of the Division for Early Childhood, 4, 53-61.

V. Integration/Transition Programs (Chapter 8)

Allan, J. (1982). Preparation for mainstreaming: A new role for counselors. Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, 16, 193-201.

Close, D. W., Irvine, L. K., Taylor, V. W., & Agosta, J. (1981). Community living skills instruction for mildly retarded persons. Exceptional Education Quarterly, 2, 75-85.

Epps, S., & Tindal, G. (1987). The effectiveness of differential programming in serving mildly handicapped students: Placement options and instructional programming. In M. C. Wang, M. C. Reynolds, & H. J. Walberg (Eds.), Handbook of special education: Research and practice (pp. 213-250). Oxford, England: Pergamon.

Ferwick, V. (1987). The Edward Smith School Program: An integrated school continuum for autistic children. In M. S. Berres & P. Knoblock (Eds.), Program models for mainstreaming: Integrating students with moderate to severe disabilities. Rockville, MD: Aspen Publishing.

Gesten, E. L., & Jason, L. A. (1987). Social and community interventions. Annual Review of Psychology, 38, 427-460.

Giangreco, M. F., & Meyer, L. H. (1988). Expanding service delivery options in regular schools and classrooms for students with severe disabilities. In J. L. Graden, J. E. Zins, & M. L. Curtis (Eds.), Alternative educational delivery systems: Enhancing instructional options for all students (pp. 241-268). Washington, DC: National Association of School Psychologists.

Gottlieb, J., & Leyser, Y. (1981). Facilitating the social mainstreaming of retarded children. Exceptional Education Quarterly, 1, 57-69.

Guralnick, M. J., & Groom, J. (1988). Peer interactions in mainstreamed and specialized classrooms: A comparative analysis. Exceptional Children, 54, 415-425.

Halvorsen, A. T., & Sailor, W. (in press). Integration of students with severe and profound disabilities: A review of research. In R. Gaylord-Ross (Ed.), Issues and research in special education, Vol. 1. New York: Columbia University Teachers College Press.

Jenkins, J., & Heinen, A. (1989). Students' preferences for service delivery: Pull-out, in-class, or integrated models. Exceptional Children, 55, 516-523.

MacGregor, G., Janssen, C.M., Larsen, L.A., & Tillery, W.L. (1986). Philadelphia's urban model project: A system-wide effort to integrate students with severe handicaps. Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 11, 61-67.

Madden, N. A., & Slavin, R. E. (1983b). Mainstreaming students with mild handicaps: Academic and social outcomes. Review of Educational Research, 53, 519-569.

Morsink, C. V. (1984). Teaching special needs students in regular classrooms. Toronto: Little Brown and Company.

Panel on Selection and Placement of Students in Programs for the Mentally Retarded. (1982). New approaches to assessment and instruction. In K. A. Heller, W. H. Holtzman, & S. Messick (Eds.), Placing children in special education. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Shestakofsky, S. (1987). The Massachusetts supported work program: The first four years. Remedial and Special Education, 8, 31-35.

Thousand, J., Fox, T., Reid, R., Godek, J., Williams, W., & Fox, W. (1986). The Homecoming model: Educating students who present intensive challenges within the regular education environment. Burlington, VT: University of Vermont, Center for Developmental Disabilities.

Thousand, J., Nevin-Parta, A., Fox, W. (1987). Inservice training to support the education of learners with severe handicaps in their local public schools. Teacher Education and Special Education, 10, 4-13.

VI. Comprehensive Restructuring (Chapter 9)

Apter, S. J. (1977). Application of ecological theory: Toward a community special education model. Exceptional Children, 43, 367-373.

Apter, S. J. (1982). Troubled children/troubled systems. New York: Pergamon.

Elliott, S. N., & Witt, J. C. (Eds.). (1986). The delivery of psychological services in schools: Concepts, processes, and issues. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Fullan, M., Miles, M. B., & Taylor, G. (1980). Organization development in schools: The state of the art. Review of Educational Research, 50, 121-183.

Goodlad, J., & Anderson, R. (in press). The nongraded school. New York, Columbia University Press.

Illback, R. J., & Zins, J. E. (1984). Organizational interventions in educational settings. In C. A. Maher, R. J. Illback, & J. E. Zins (Eds.), Organizational psychology in the schools. Springfield, IL: Thomas.

Lippitt, G. L., Langseth, P., & Mossop, J. (1986). Implementing organizational change. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Maher, C. A., Illback, R. J., & Zins, J. E. (Eds.). (1984). Organizational psychology in the schools: A handbook for professionals. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Morsink, C. V., Thomas, C. C., & Smith-Davis, J. (1987). Noncategorical special education programs: Process and outcomes. In M. C. Reynolds, M. C. Wang, & H. J. Walberg (Eds.), The handbook of special education: Research and practice (pp. 287-312). Oxford, England: Pergamon Press.

Schmuck, R. A., & Runkel, P. J. (1985). The handbook of organizational development in schools (3rd ed.). Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield Publishing.

Stainback, S., & Stainback, W. (in press). Classroom organization for diversity among students. In D. Biklen, D. Ferguson, & A. Ford (Eds.), Disability and society. Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education.

Stainback, W. & Stainback, S. (1984). A rationale for the merger of special and regular education. Exceptional Children, 51, 102-111.

Will, M. (1986). Educating children with learning problems: A shared responsibility. Exceptional Children, 32, 411-418.



The National Association of School Psychologists
808 17th Street NW
Washington, DC 20006